

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 747	24	HE 002 558
AUTHOR	Stone, James H.	
TITLE	The Academic and Post-Graduate Careers of the Master of Arts Graduates in General Humanities in a Liberal Arts College.	
INSTITUTION	San Francisco State Coll., Calif.	
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.e	
BUREAU NO	BR-5-8260	
PUB DATE	66	
NOTE	92p.	
EDRS PRICE	MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29	
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Choice; Doctoral Degrees; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Humanities; *Masters Degrees; *Student Characteristics	

ABSTRACT

To identify major strengths and weaknesses in the Master of Arts Program in Humanities at San Francisco State College and assess what the program had contributed to the vocational future of its graduates, an evaluative study was made of forty-seven degree candidates. The study consisted of: (1) the history and curriculum of the M.A. humanities program; (2) personal and academic backgrounds of the M.A. graduates; (3) the character and quality of the graduate work; (4) post-graduate careers of the M.A. graduates: nonacademic vocations and doctoral study; (5) post-graduate careers of the M.A. graduates: teachers; (6) conclusions. The appendix contains a bibliography and review of recent articles on humanities, careers and interests. The study revealed that the M.A. graduates preferred an interdisciplinary curriculum over the traditional one-subject approach, and that the M.A. in humanities graduates met or exceeded normal standards for advanced education. The study did not provide comparative data on successful and disqualified candidates. It did, however, present twenty statistical tables comparing the undergraduate and graduate academic achievement of the forty-seven M.A. graduates on the basis of sex. (Author/BHC)

ED054747

BR-5-8260

PA-24

HE

THE ACADEMIC AND POST-GRADUATE
CAREERS OF THE MASTER OF ARTS GRADUATES IN
GENERAL HUMANITIES IN A LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

Cooperative Research Project
No. S-406

by

James H. Stone, Ph.D.
Professor of Humanities and English

assisted by

Ruth Grant Knier, M.A.
Instructor in Humanities

San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California

1966

The research reported herein was supported
by the Cooperative Research Program of the
Office of Education, U.S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL POSITION OR POLICY.

6-30-67M

Table of Contents

I.	The History and Curriculum of the Master of Arts Program in Humanities	1
	Notes for Chapter I	4
II.	The Personal and Academic Backgrounds of the Masters of Arts in Humanities	6
	Notes for Chapter II	12
III.	The Character and Quality of the Graduate Work of the Masters of Arts in Humanities	18
	Notes for Chapter III	31
IV.	The Post-Graduate Careers of the Master of Arts Graduates: Non- Academic Vocations and Doctoral Study	36
	Notes for Chapter IV	45
V.	The Post-Graduate Careers of the Master of Arts Graduates: the Teachers	50
	Notes for Chapter V	56
VI.	Conclusions: The Past and the Future	60
	Bibliography	63
	Appendix A: Questionnaires	64
	Appendix B: Bibliographical Supplement: Review of Recent Writing regarding the Humanities	70

Index of Tables

I. Personal Characteristics of the Master of Arts Graduates	6
II. Undergraduate Fields of Preparation	7
III. Extent and Quality of Undergraduate Preparation:	8
A. Semester Units and Grade Point Averages	
B. Percentage Distribution of Undergraduate Grade Point Averages Earned in Humanities Subjects	
IV. Undergraduate Preparation in the Principal Humanities Subjects	10
V. Achievement on Graduate Record Examination Humanities Area Test	11
VI. Period of Study and Units Earned by Graduates of the M.A. Program	19
VII. Scope and Quality of Graduate Course Work:	20
A. Grade Point Averages in Graduate Course Work	
B. Units and Grade Point Averages in Courses in Humanities and Other Subjects	
C. Units and Grade Point Averages in the Specialized Humanities Subjects	
VIII. Personal and Academic Background of Graduates in the Lower and Higher Ranges of Grade Point Averages	22
IX. Fields of Undergraduate Major Relative to Grade Point Average in M.A. Program	23
X. Grade Point Averages in M.A. Program of Men and Women:	23
A. Comparison of Grade Point Averages	
B. Distribution of Grade Point Averages in M.A. Program, by Sex	
XI. Students with Below-Average Undergraduate and Graduate Grade Point Averages	24
XII. Graduate Record Examination Ranks Relative to Grade Point Averages in M.A. Program	24
XIII. Background and Grade Point Average of Students in Humanities Seminars	27

XIV. Background and Grade Point Average of Students with a C-Grade in a Humanities Seminar	28
XV. Background and Academic Record of Eight Examinees	29
XVI. Master of Arts Graduates in Non-Academic Careers	37
XVII. Non-Academic Post-Graduate Occupations	38
XVIII. Master of Arts Graduates in Ph.D. Programs	42
XIX. Grade Point Averages of Groups Pursuing Different Careers . . .	46
XX. Master of Arts Graduates in Teaching	50

I. The History and Curriculum of the Master of Arts Program in Humanities

The Humanities Division (later Department) at San Francisco State College opened its Master of Arts program in Humanities in Spring semester, 1957. The program was designed to train junior college teachers. The curriculum reflected the interdisciplinary faith of some members of the Division, and it took account of the instructional practices of California junior colleges. Few offered integrated humanities courses, but a number expressed interest in starting them. The College anticipated that its humanities graduates would foster such developments, and that they would also teach in conventional fields. Accordingly, the candidates in the new program took at least nine semester hours of work in English and nine in philosophy. Their required interdisciplinary courses included an introductory seminar, a seminar on the arts, and a two-semester terminal seminar on "Problems of Integration." Three other seminars, investigating the relationships of literature, philosophy, and history to one another and to the arts, were available as elective courses.¹

Neither the faculty nor students were content to let the initial plan stand unexamined or unrevised. The former, having interdisciplinary doctoral training and experience with the integrated, general education humanities course of the College, were eager to explore new ground. The latter were persistently curious about the *raison d'être*, scope, and philosophical foundations of a synthesizing and integrating curriculum. Changes coincided with growth. Generally speaking, two trends of development emerged. One affected the quality and the other modified the substance of the program.

In 1959 and again in 1963, the department clarified and expanded its admission requirements. Since these dates students have entered the graduate program in a conditional status unless they have had an undergraduate major in one of the humanistic fields and at least basic work in the others; or unless they have completed a well-organized humanities A.B. program. Advisers have been assiduous in establishing pre-candidacy course requirements for students with deficiencies in preparation. Without a functional substantive background, the faculty found, even well-intentioned and intelligent students floundered in the integrated seminars.²

Better to assess the candidates' total competence, the department instituted a final master of arts examination in 1961. It includes a written and an oral section. In its earliest form the examination covered a set of ten master-works in humanities. Four such sets were drawn up as alternatives for study by the candidates. Minor adjustments in the plan occurred in 1963, and in 1964 the pre-established lists were dropped in favor of two to six master-works (including at least one in the fine arts) which the candidate chooses in consultation with the faculty. The candidate is expected to treat the works with a just and integrated understanding of their full dimensions, characteristics, and qualities, without being restricted by the formulae of any one of the conventional academic disciplines.³

Changes in the substance of the program modified the balance between specialized and integrated studies. On the one hand, the integrated courses aroused the greatest interest among students and faculty and manifestly produced the greatest challenges, if not difficulties, in the program. On the other hand, students seldom seemed to achieve much integration in their 18 units of course work in literature and philosophy. Although such courses often did fit coherently into work done during the undergraduate years, seen currently they appeared isolated. In 1958 this defect prompted a program revision. The candidates were required to take one of the seminars on literature, philosophy, or history in the humanities, in addition to the originally-required seminars on art and on integration in the humanities. Even so, the centrifugal effect of specialized undergraduate and graduate study continued to be prominent. Too often in the terminal seminar the students still were asking elementary questions about ways to correlate the methods and achievements of the special disciplines, or about the means and purposes of integrating ideas, forms, and cultural patterns.

In 1963, therefore, the program was reconstituted. It was turned "right side up" by reversing the relationship between specialized and integrative courses. All four of the interdisciplinary seminars now are required--art in the humanities, literature in the humanities, etc. The sequence culminates in a one-semester seminar on integration. Three more humanities courses extend the core. Two of them are chosen by the student from a new series of seminars on European, American, and Chinese form and culture. To keep alive the candidate's earlier training in a single humanities subject, six units are allotted for work outside the department. In addition, since 1961, the candidates have been required to demonstrate reading proficiency in an ancient or modern language other than English.⁴

An especially interesting feature of the revised program is the system of tutorial "sponsorship." Each candidate is asked to meet regularly, although informally, with one of the faculty. One purpose of the conferences is to assist the candidate in choosing and studying the master-works he will present for his final comprehensive examination. The faculty hopes that in this manner the examination will be the climax of a sustained program of inquiry, well integrated with other parts of the program. The tutorial meetings may serve other purposes as well: consideration of academic problems which the candidate encounters in the program; and exploration of broad educational questions raised, but not necessarily settled, in the seminars. At its least ambitious level, the sponsorship plan is a useful adjunct to the final examination and other formal aspects of graduate study. At its best, the system provides a prolonged program of individualized tutorial education.

Two evaluations of the graduate program occurred in its early years. One, a careful and constructive survey by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, called attention to the need for firmer control over the quality and coherence of the students' work. It commended the faculty's intention, at the time of the survey, to establish a foreign language requirement and a final examination.⁵ In a second evaluative study in 1960, one of the present investigators attempted to reach some informal conclusions regarding the standards of preparation and performance set by the first group of graduate students. The results of this inquiry were suggestive but imprecise. It appeared that the candidates' grades in courses outside the

Humanities Department were as high or higher than those they earned in humanities seminars, as a rule. Whether the integrated seminars were too demanding was an open question. But at least it did not seem that the department was attracting students to its new program by being unduly hospitable or patronizing. A check of Graduate Record Examination Humanities Area Test scores was similarly inconclusive. As a predictive instrument the Humanities Area Test showed some possibilities. Sixty per cent of those who had dropped out of the program (for a number of reasons, but seldom because of academic default) scored below the 85th percentile--but so did 40% of the candidates who earned the degree!

Student comments gathered in the second evaluative inquiry were favorable toward the program. Most candidates put particular emphasis on the values to them of the integrated seminars. Some, however, complained of variations in theoretical outlook among the faculty, and they expressed concern about the difficulties they felt they encountered in identifying themselves with their instructors, either as persons or as representatives of various modes of humanistic scholarship.

Together the two evaluations helped the faculty along paths of reflection which led ultimately to revisions of the program. Too, these evaluative episodes sustained the department's awareness of the exploratory character of its work. It began a series of monthly meetings--"colloquia"-- wherein its members led discussions on theoretical and substantive topics in integrative scholarship and teaching. In 1965, two years after the last major revision of the program, the present investigator concluded that the time was opportune for a new evaluative study. With this view others in the department concurred. By then nearly 50 men and women had graduated from the program. It was possible to ask what had been the personal attributes of the successful candidates. What patterns of academic preparation were related to effective interdisciplinary scholarship? What continuities and what variations appeared in the candidates' graduate programs, over the years? By 1965 most of the graduates were settled in academic or non-academic careers. What had the program contributed to the personal and vocational future of its graduates? From the curiosity aroused by such questions the present study emerged.⁶

The value which the local community expected to gain from self-examination is obvious. Errors discovered might become errors corrected. Success recognized might be the earned increment that financed further investment. Possibly, too, the study would interest others engaged in like enterprises. The master of arts is the neglected degree in educational research, despite the large numbers of men and women who earn it and become professional educators.⁷ Furthermore, interdisciplinary graduate humanities programs are new and rare. There is little published information about them as yet.⁸ The picture here painted of one of them may or may not seem exemplary. But the more that can be learned of such programs the better, as long as they are young, experimental, and a challenge to the national predilection for hard-edged specialization.

* * * *

Notes

1. Teaching credential candidates must take approximately 14 semester units of work in professional education (including student teaching) in addition to the M.A. program. New State regulations adopted in 1964 also require them to have at least 12 semester units of graduate work in a single subject, if the program is of an interdepartmental type.

2. Until 1963 the faculty had no way of imposing conditions for admission to graduate study at the College. A new policy begun in that year, however, now allows the department to inform applicants officially of the prerequisites to entrance that it deems necessary. A department representative evaluates applications for admission on the basis of academic transcripts and, whenever possible, an interview.

3. The four-hour written section covers two or three works in the group which the candidate has studied. The examiners give him a week's notice of the works to be treated. He may consult the texts during the examination. The oral section ranges over the entire group of master-works. For example, one of the originally-used lists included: St. Augustine, Confessions; Delacroix, Journal; Melville, Moby-Dick; Milton, Paradise Lost; Scott, Architecture of Humanism; Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, Federalist; Plato, Republic; Freud, Civilization and Its Discontents; Virgil, Aeneid; Swift, Gulliver's Travels; Clarendon, History of the Rebellion. Such works continue to be chosen for the current examinations.

4. Of major significance in the background of this program revision was the growth of the humanities undergraduate program between 1957 and 1963. A much-enlarged list of interdisciplinary courses in classical, European, American, and Oriental form and culture, and in particular themes or problems ("Humanism and Education;" "Music and the History of Ideas;" "Biography of a City: Florence;" etc.); additional faculty; and larger enrollments combined to give "elbow room" for graduate enterprises which had not been possible when the M.A. program began. Simultaneously, of course, the number of graduate students increased steadily, though gradually.

5. Chester L. Neudling and James H. Blessing, Graduate General Humanities Programs, Bulletin 1960, No. 12, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 83-90. The program in its early form also is described by James H. Stone, "General Education and Graduate Education," Improving College and University Teaching, X (Winter, 1962), pp. 42-47. The author there noted the department's intention to require a foreign language and a final examination, the care needed in evaluating the preparation of applicants, and the importance of the integrative seminars.

6. The Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through its Cooperative Research Program, provided financial support for the research here reported. In 1964, a small grant from the Faculty Research Office of San Francisco State College made it possible to determine whether or not adequate records were available to undertake the research. Dr. Stone, the principal investigator, planned and directed the project throughout, examined the relevant bibliography, and prepared the final report. Mrs. Knier

collected data, carried out all but a few of the statistical calculations, and collated the questionnaire responses from the graduates. Dr. William Mason, Director of the Office of Institutional Studies at the College, calculated the significance of the differences between the undergraduate grade averages of the male and female graduates. Dr. Matthew Evans of the Humanities Department, and Dr. George Feliz, Dean of Graduate Studies, read and made helpful comments on a draft version of the final report. Funds for the duplication of the final report were granted by the Frederic Burk Foundation for Education at the College. It also provided for fiscal administration of the project.

7. The number of students taking the M.A. degree is steadily rising. From 1951-1960, 64,000 M.A. degrees were awarded annually, on the average. In 1962-3, there were almost 90,000 who earned the degree: Walter C. Eells, Degrees in Higher Education (Washington, D.C., The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963) p. 79; Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), p. 129; Everett Walters, ed., Graduate Education Today (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1965), p. 74.

8. The only comprehensive survey of humanities graduate programs of the interdisciplinary type is that of Neudling and Blessing, op. cit. Gustave O. Arlt, writing on "New Trends in Graduate Study in the Humanities," in Walters, op. cit., pp. 185-201, takes notice of "Area Studies" programs involving the humanities, but not of "general humanities" curricula.

II. The Personal and Academic Backgrounds of the Masters of Arts in Humanities

Between February, 1957, and January, 1965, approximately 180 students applied for graduate study in humanities. At the later date, about 30 were actively taking work toward the degree; about 10 were temporarily inactive or were on the verge of leaving the program. Ninety-one had been disqualified during the eight-year period. Forty-seven had earned the Master of Arts degree.¹ It is the latter group which has been studied in detail, since only for the successful graduates is it possible to determine the required data on academic preparation, performance in the program, and post-graduate careers.

Among the successful graduates, men outnumbered women three to one,² a distribution identical with that for all who applied for the program during these years. In age the group resembled Ph.D. candidates in the relatively advanced points at which they began graduate study and attained the degree.³ The mean and median ages of the women in the group were approximately two years higher than those of the men. Social as well as chronological maturity is suggested by the fact that almost half of the successful candidates were married when they began graduate study.⁴ There were proportionately more married men than women. Academic records do not indicate whether students are employed, but it is safe to say that about three-quarters of the graduates held either part/or full-time jobs while earning their degrees.⁵

Table I

Personal Characteristics of the Master of Arts Graduates

A. Sex and Marital Status

	<u>Single</u>		<u>Married</u>		<u>Divorced</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Men (35)	16	46%	18	51%	1	3%
Women (12)	4	33%	5	42%	3	25%
Totals (47)	20	43%	23	49%	4	8%

B. Age Distributions

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
Age at attainment of A.B. degree	20-47	25	23
Age at application for M.A. program	23-55	30	28
Age at attainment of M.A. degree	24-58	32	30

The M.A. graduates came into the humanities program with A.B., B.S., or Ph.B. degrees from 21 colleges and universities. Nearly two-thirds had done their undergraduate work at San Francisco State College (16 students) or very nearby institutions: the University of California at Berkeley (9), Stanford University (3), the University of San Francisco (2), and San Jose State College (1).⁶ Other graduates held university degrees from California at Los Angeles, Chicago, Colorado State, Columbia, Connecticut, Harvard, Indiana, Miami, Louisiana State, Princeton, Montana State, and Puget Sound (one each). One degree-holder came from each of the following colleges: Macalester, Park, Southern California Bible, and St. Mary's of the Lake Seminary. A picture of an even more diverse undergraduate background is sketched by the list of institutions which the students attended, in addition to those where they earned their bachelor's degrees. There were 63 such "other attendances" at 50 colleges and universities. Taking into account all instances of undergraduate study by the 47 M.A. graduates, there were 110 attendances at 19 different junior colleges, seminaries, and specialized institutions, and 45 four-year colleges and universities in the United States and abroad.⁷

As undergraduates the successful M.A. candidates were prepared in 15 major fields and 12 minor fields of study. Twenty-two had no minor field, but three had completed two minors and four had had substantial training outside of the collegiate environment. Not all the students had majored in a humanities subject (history, literature and language, philosophy and religion, or one of the arts). Thirty-seven (79%) of the 47 had done so, however. Majors in English or Language Arts, and in philosophy or religion were especially numerous. Their number exceeded that of the majors in all other humanities fields and in all subjects outside the humanities area. A similar distribution occurred in the minor fields. Half were in philosophy or English. Other humanities subjects were represented in seven instances.⁸ Three of the four students who were especially well trained in a field outside the major or minor had done work in the fine arts (sculpture in one case, music in two cases). One had a degree in Library Science as well as an A.B.

Table II
Undergraduate Fields of Preparation

<u>Fields of the A.B. Major</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Fields of the A.B. Minor</u>	<u>Number</u>
English and Language Arts	11	Philosophy	7
Philosophy and Theology	9	English	6
Foreign Language	4	Social Sciences	3
Humanities interdisciplinary program	4	Foreign Language	2
General liberal arts (humanities emphasis)	3	Humanities interdisciplinary program	1
Social Sciences (government; economics)	3	Music	1
History	3	Literature	1
Psychology	2	Art	1
Music	1	History	1
Radio-TV	1	Anthropology	1
Engineering	1	Pre-medical curriculum	1
Drama	1	Education	1
Art	1		
Education	1		

Undergraduate preparation in the several fields of the humanities was required for entrance into the graduate program. Seven of the successful candidates had had less than 30 semester units in humanities subjects. Three had had 100 units.⁹ No stipulations were made regarding undergraduate records (beyond the College requirement of the C-average implied by possession of the A.B. degree). Most of the graduates had very respectable to excellent undergraduate grade point averages in the fields relevant to their graduate program. The grade point average which the women had earned exceeded that of the men.

Table III

Extent and Quality of Undergraduate Preparation

A. Semester Units and Grade Point Averages*

	Total	Men	Women
Group			
(46)**	(34)**	(12)	
Semester units in humanities subjects			
Range	15-100	15-100	31-89
Mean	57	57	55
Median	54	54	51
Grade point averages in humanities subjects			
Range	2.26-3.90	2.26-3.90	2.57-3.77
Mean	3.07	3.00	3.28
Median	3.03	3.00	3.34

*Grade points per unit: A--4; B--3; C--2; D--1

**See note 9, below.

B. Percentage Distribution of Undergraduate Grade Point Averages in Humanities Subjects*

<u>Ranges of Grade Point Averages</u>	Total	Group	Men	Women
	F%	Cum. F%	F%	Cum. F%
2.25-2.49	7%	7%	9%	9%
2.50-2.74	15%	22%	18%	27%
2.75-2.99	17%	39%	20%	47%
3.00-3.24	31%	70%	35%	82%
3.25-3.49	13%	83%	6%	88%
3.50-3.74	11%	94%	6%	94%
3.75-3.99	6%	100%	6%	100%

*Literature, drama, and language (but not basic English or foreign language classes); history; philosophy and religion; the fine arts; interdisciplinary humanities courses.

These statistical indices of the students' preparation are suggestive in their main tendencies. But caution is required in interpreting details. Considering the diverse academic origins of the humanities graduate students, this caveat is especially necessary. From instructor to instructor, department to department, and school to school, unknown degrees of similarity and variation must be assumed with respect to grading standards and practices, and in regard to the scope and content of the curricula. The cases at the extremes of the statistical distributions in Table III B. illustrate the disparity that may exist between the individual and the group norms. The student with the highest undergraduate grade point average also had the largest number of undergraduate units in humanities subjects. But he only earned a 3.0 grade point average as a graduate student. He had the lowest percentile rank on the Graduate Record Examination Humanities Area Test except for two students who had language handicaps when they took the examination. At the other end of the scale, the three students in the lowest range of undergraduate grade point averages had GRE Humanities Area Test scores at the 85th, 96th, and 98th percentile ranks. Two became junior college teachers immediately after receiving the M.A. degree. The third had taken a B.S. degree in Business Administration. After taking the M.A. in humanities, he acquired a Ph.D. in an interdisciplinary program and now is an Associate Professor in an eastern university.

Men and women did not differ greatly in the average and median numbers of units taken in humanities subjects. This being the case, it is possible to surmise (considering the small number of women involved) that the difference shown in the range of units taken results from a sampling imperfection. This hypothesis can be tested later, when the number of graduates has increased substantially.

The women's superior mean and median grade point averages warrant more extensive comment. Two-thirds of the women, but only one-third of the men attained an undergraduate grade point average above 3.25 in humanities subjects. Conversely, almost 40% of the men, but only 16% of the women failed to earn a grade point average of 3.00 as undergraduates. The difference in the mean averages of men and women is significant at the .05 level of critical value. No factor except sex seemed to correlate with a significant deviation from the median grade point average range of 3.00-3.25.¹⁰ This observation leads to several questions. Do undergraduate women normally garner the lion's share of high grades in humanities courses? Are men with modest academic records more bold than comparable women when it comes to venturing into graduate study? Are women likely to attempt the master of arts program only when they have strong evidence of a clear margin of excellence in undergraduate preparation? Or are there local campus factors involved, such that a more heterogeneous group of men appears in the humanities program, while programs other than humanities receive a more heterogeneous group of women? Such questions as these cannot be critically treated until more data have accumulated. But in view of the national shortage of qualified teachers and advanced degree candidates, no clues should be overlooked in the search for fields of study wherein women--the great group of unused potential scholars and college teachers--show special capacities for excellence.¹¹

Table IV

Undergraduate Preparation in the Principal
Humanities Subjects

<u>Subject</u>	<u>No. enrolling in one or more courses</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
English (not including freshman composition)	38	3-42	17.6	18.0
Units		2.0-4.0	3.05	3.0
Grade point average (G.P.A.)				
Literature (including literature in a foreign language or in translation)	22	2-17	6.5	4.0
Units		2.0-4.0	3.25	3.25
G.P.A.				
History	27	2-33	12.0	9.0
Units		1.3-4.0	2.82	3.0
G.P.A.				
Philosophy and religion	40	3-67	19.0	12.5
Units		1.66-4.0	3.04	3.0
G.P.A.				
Humanities (interdisciplinary courses)	19	1-32	11.7	7.0
Units		2.0-4.0	3.14	3.0
G.P.A.				
Fine Arts	56*	1-62	8.73	4.0
Units		1.8-4.0	2.98	3.0
G.P.A.				

*General or introductory, 15; art history, 5; painting, 5; music, 22; architecture, 2; others, 7.

On the whole, the M.A. graduates appeared to be about equally well prepared in each of the principal humanities subjects. If English and other literature courses are considered together, then the fields of least preparation were history and the fine arts.

Twenty-six of the 47 M.A. graduates had acquired basic proficiency in a foreign language before beginning graduate study. Seven of them were prepared in two languages. Seventeen had studied French; six, Spanish; five, German; three, Greek, and one each Latin and Russian. Almost none who completed the program during the years under study (or subsequently) needed to start a language "from scratch," although there were few who felt confident about taking the examination immediately after enrolling.

A final estimate of the successful graduates' preparation is provided by their scores on the Graduate Record Examination Humanities Area Test. An earlier and less precise evaluation of this index suggested only that about 60% of those who completed the program would have scores at the 85th percentile or higher on the national scale. For the 47 M.A. graduates, the range of scores was wide, but most were in the upper percentile ranks. Again, women tended to outscore men.¹²

Table V

Achievement on Graduate Record Examination Humanities Area Test

	<u>Range of %ile rank*</u>	<u>Mean %ile rank*</u>	<u>Median %ile rank*</u>	<u>Modal %ile rank*</u>
Total group	44-99plus	87	94	99
Men	44-99	87	93	98
Women	64-99plus	93	97	99

*national scale, men and women

In this group of successful candidates, 22--just under one-half of the total number--scored from the 95th to the 99plus percentile rank on the Humanities Area Test. Two-thirds of the group achieved scores above the 89th percentile, and three-quarters above the 84th percentile. A student with a foreign language background scored below the 50th percentile; two fell in the 50-59 percentile range; four, 60-64 percentiles; three, 70-74 percentiles; and one, 80-84 percentiles. It would appear that between 1960, when the first check of GRE scores was made, and 1965, better prepared candidates had entered the program. The contrast between them and applicants who did not complete the program became more noticeable.¹³

In summation, the most prominent aspects of the personal and academic backgrounds of the successful M.A. graduates are as follows:

First, they were mature, seasoned, and broadly educated. Second, they had performed better in several of the humanities subjects than does the average undergraduate in a single field. Their B or better grades in their majors, minors, and ancillary humanities courses put them on a par with students in specialized fields who also aspire to and are usually accepted into advanced degree programs. Their Graduate Record Examination scores in the area wherein they intended graduate study confirmed the testimony of their undergraduate grades. Contrary to views occasionally expressed, then, the undergraduates who succeeded in the graduate program were not from a class of dilettantish, academically weak, or disoriented students, fleeing "more rigorous" specialized curricula. They were different in kind from single-subject undergraduates, but equal in quality.¹⁴

Third, the undergraduate fields of English and philosophy (and religion) have been the greatest sources of humanities M.A. graduates. However, the fine arts have had an important supporting role. They contributed few majors

or minors, but the number of enrollments in art courses exceeded the number of enrollments in any other humanities field (unless courses in foreign language literature are combined with English and literature in translation). History did not contribute a substantial number of candidates, nor did it equal literature, philosophy, or the arts as a field in which M.A. graduates had taken one or more undergraduate courses. (The contribution would be significantly less if, from the number of such courses taken, required American history or History of Western Civilization courses were deducted).¹⁵

And, finally, about one-fifth of the 47 who earned the degree had relatively unpromising undergraduate records. Some had majored in fields other than humanities. Others earned only average undergraduate grades or did rather poorly on the Graduate Record Examination Humanities Area Test. The success in graduate work of these students suggests certain questions. Is a 20% margin for error needed in evaluating undergraduate records? Were graduate standards too lenient? But the difference between undergraduate and graduate achievement in these cases can also lead the observer to ask: why did these students improve themselves? Discussion of such questions forms part of the presentation below of the candidates' achievement in the M.A. program itself.

Judging by the undergraduate records of the 47 M.A. graduates, a favorable decision on an application for graduate study would be warranted if the applicant had had multidimensional and substantial preparation in several humanities subjects; grades in humanities courses averaging from 2.75 upward; and a GRE Humanities Area Test score which put him above the 89th percentile. Less promising records would necessarily lead to guarded predictions about the success of the applicant; attentiveness to the possible need for additional preparation; and sensitivity to signs of difficulty. Whether the evidence on the 47 successful graduates indicates the propriety of excluding the less impressive applicants is a delicate question. Under heavier pressures to admit students than prevailed between 1957 and 1965, such applicants would vie with better-prepared students for places in the college. On the contrary, however, since one-fifth of the successful 47 would have been excluded had entry into the program required high undergraduate grades or Graduate Record Examination scores, the "redemptioned" students might be called an unexpected 20% profit on the educational investment. In any enterprise such a profit margin justifies substantial effort and risk.¹⁶

* * * *

Notes

1. The figures are approximate, except for the number of those who earned the degree. A few students taking course work in Spring semester, 1965, had come belatedly and had not yet completed their applications. Others still listed as bona fide applicants and candidates were near the point of dropping out. Among the 91 disqualified students, 59 (64.8%) had been dropped administratively because of their inactivity. In such cases almost no information is available regarding the reasons the students left the program; some, however, cannot really be said to have begun it. Ten (10.9%) formally

requested cancellation of their applications; usually no reason was given for the request. Three (4.5%) transferred to other departments in the College; perhaps others did so or went to other institutions without informing the humanities faculty. Nineteen records (20.8%) show that the student was disqualified for unsatisfactory academic performance or, in the greatest number of such cases, would have been disqualified had he not voluntarily departed. In virtually none of the cases of disqualified students is anything known of subsequent academic or non-academic activity. The insufficiency of information and records, therefore, makes almost fruitless any attempts at an evaluative study which includes the unsuccessful as well as the successful students.

The records are complete and exact, however, for the M.A. graduates. The sources from which data came include the adviser's files; the College file of permanent academic records, including transcripts from other institutions, Graduate Record Examination scores, and the student's application; the files of the Graduate Study Office; and questionnaires sent to the M.A. graduates. All but one of the graduates was located, he being a student from the Near East who, perhaps, returned to his homeland. Forty-six, then, answered letters sent them to establish a current address file and to obtain basic data regarding post-graduate careers. As is indicated in Chapter IV, below, most also completed questionnaires regarding their academic and post-graduate activities, attitudes, and beliefs.

2. What proportion should be expected? The number of women taking the A.B. in humanities subjects exceeds men: Robert H. Knapp, The Origins of Humanistic Scholars (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 60. Men outnumber women by a wide margin in advanced degrees. In English and history, male doctoral graduates constitute 61% and 76%, respectively, of the total graduates in the two subjects. High undergraduate grades correlate with decisions to undertake graduate study, but this relationship is more often true for men than for women. On the other hand, women are more likely to decide not to take up advanced study if they have a low undergraduate grade average. For all graduate students, vocational goals are important, but women are less frequently motivated than men to take up the doctorate for vocational reasons alone: George L. Gropper and Robert Fitzpatrick, Who Goes to Graduate School? (Pittsburgh, American Institute for Research, 1959), pp. 9, 15-16, 24, 31-32, 49, 57.

3. Data on doctoral students indicate that an average of 10 years elapses between the A.B. and Ph.D. degrees in humanities subjects. The median age of those earning the Ph.D. is 31-32 at the time the degree is awarded. Those who have three or more dependents are older than the median age group, as a rule: Berelson, op. cit., pp. 157-158; National Research Council, Doctorate Production in United States Universities, 1920-1962 (Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, 1963), pp. 31-32, 43-45.

In a small sample of 117 applicants for graduate study at San Francisco State College in 1963, 47% had applied within two years of receiving the A.B. degree. Two-thirds of the 117 took five or more semesters to earn the M.A. Almost one-fifth took from three to four semesters to complete their masters' programs: San Francisco State College, Office of Institutional Study, unpublished "Survey of Classified Graduate Students," September 1, 1965.

4. According to Berelson, op. cit., pp. 134-135, half the doctoral candidates in the United States are married when they begin their work. The N.R.C. report, op. cit., pp. 44-45, shows a strong correlation between the candidates' number of dependents and the time they take to earn the Ph.D.

5. A study of the students of San Francisco State College reported that two-thirds were employed in part or full-time jobs: Nevitt Sanford, ed., The American College (New York, John Wiley and Son, Inc., 1962), p. 162.

6. It appears that 15-20% of those who earn the Ph.D. do so at the institution where they took the A.B. About 35% of the doctoral candidates do their undergraduate and graduate work in the same state: Berelson, op. cit., p. 130. The picture on the Pacific Coast, however, appears to be markedly different from that for the nation at large. At the Berkeley campus of the University of California, approximately 40% of the doctoral students were "natives." A comparable situation existed at the Los Angeles branch of the university, and at the University of Washington. However, the same institutional and regional bias did not prevail at Stanford University: National Research Council, op. cit., p. 33; Knapp, op. cit., pp. 126-133. The 1963 study of an unrefined sample of graduate students at San Francisco State College indicated that 33% had taken the A.B. at the College; 77% had completed their undergraduate work at California institutions: S.F.S.C. "Survey," op. cit., Table A-I.

7. These evidences of migration are the more striking if it is observed that many shifts within the state of California would entail travel equal to that which would carry a student across several states in the East. The 63 additional attendances were distributed among the following institutions (one each, unless otherwise indicated): University of California at Berkeley (10); University of California at Los Angeles (2); Long Beach Junior College (3); California School of Fine Arts (2); Bakersfield, Santa Ana, Canal Zone, Oakland, Los Angeles, Morton, Shasta, John Muir, Marin, Monterey Peninsula junior colleges; American Academy of Asian Studies (San Francisco); Quigley Preparatory Seminary; St. Mary's College (Illinois); Gregorian College; Monticello College; Mexico City College; Carleton College; College Cerenol (France); San Jose State College; Central Washington College; Chico State College; New England Conservatory of Music; Jefferson College; and the universities of Iowa, Iowa State, Wesleyan, Stanford, Colorado State, Louisiana State, Kent State, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Northwestern, Fordham, Chicago, Nebraska, Brandeis, Michigan, Wyoming, Loyola, Paris, Marseilles, Florence, and Oslo.

8. Knapp's study of the sources of humanistic scholars shows the empirical grounds for expecting that the humanities subjects will recruit students from one another: op. cit., p. 6. In his investigation, he came to believe English to be the most "eclectic" and varied of humanities subjects: op. cit., pp. 159-160. Hence it might be inferred that English would be a major source of interdisciplinary students. Philosophy programs, he observed, were often sharply divided between the work of the linguists and logicians, on the one hand, and of traditional scholars, on the other. The former, he found, preferred to link themselves to the sciences rather than to the humanities: op. cit., p. 159. A further inference, then (sustained by informal comments from some of the humanities M.A. graduates), is that a philosophy student who enters an interdisciplinary program in humanities has chosen it in preference

to certain contemporary emphases in philosophy. It is also relevant to note that the subjects embraced by the humanities interdisciplinary program are relatively strong producers of Ph.D. candidates. Undergraduate students from them are more likely to take up a graduate program in a subject other than that of the A.B. major than is the case with the sciences: N.R.C., op. cit., p. 35. "Field changers," according to one study, do about as well in graduate work as those who take the A.B. and Ph.D. in the same subject: Sanford, op. cit., p. 582.

9. One man, trained abroad as an engineer, acquired his learning in the humanities in the lower schools and by self-study, which led him to become (in his off-duty time) a successful teacher in adult education and other community programs. In the tables relating to undergraduate units and grade point averages, he is omitted, since it is impossible to calculate his hours of preparation and he has no college grades prior to graduate study. Six men had had from 15 to 25 units in humanities subjects as undergraduates. The 1963 sample group of S.F.S.C. graduate students presented a median undergraduate grade point average of 3.2 in the proposed graduate field. Forty-nine percent had done less than 25 semester units of undergraduate work in the field of the proposed graduate major. The median number of preparatory units was only 20: S.F.S.C. "Survey," op. cit.

10. When the frequency distributions of the students' ages, marital status, field of major, and units taken were plotted against the frequency distribution of grade point averages, the medians in all categories except those for women, divorced students, and students who had taken 50-59 units in humanities subjects corresponded with the 3.00-3.24 median range in the distribution of grade averages. The median group of students with 50-59 units in humanities courses corresponded with the 2.75-2.99 grade point average range, as would be expected when it is considered that men tended to take more units than women and tended to be more numerous in the lower grade point average ranges (Table III). But the median point in the distribution of women and of divorced students according to grade averages corresponded to the 3.25-3.49 range. Since three of the four divorced students were women, the feminine component in the higher grade point ranges seems clearly and differentially defined.

11. The relative number of women earning the M.A. or the Ph.D. has declined since World War II. Women now receive about 31 per cent of the M.A. degrees awarded annually. At the same time the number of college teachers with only the M.A. degree has risen to above half of the total faculties. Recent figures on newly-hired college teachers indicate that about 60% do not have the Ph.D.: Knapp, op. cit., p. 60, Berelson, op. cit., p. 135; National Research Council, op. cit., p. 49; Eells, op. cit., p. 79; Walters, op. cit., p. 64. Gropper and Fitzpatrick, op. cit., pp. 29, 31-32, 49, 57, found that women tended to decide later than men to go to graduate school; that low undergraduate grade averages tended to be more discouraging to women than to men when the question of graduate work was being considered; and that educational (rather than vocational) goals were more often foremost for women than for men, when they decided to attempt advanced study. John L. Snell, discussing "The Master's Degree," in Walters, op. cit., pp. 74-102, calls attention to the distribution of men and women among the fields in which the M.A. is earned. In English, journalism, the arts, and foreign languages, the number of degrees

which women earn is on a par with those earned by men. In only one other field, education, is this close to being true. Women outnumber men several times over in the fields of home economics and librarianship.

Carl Bereiter and Mervin B. Freedman, in Sanford, op. cit., are not particularly helpful on the matter of sex-differentiation with regard to fields of study. They point out the obvious: "The man who elects to specialize in the arts or a social science...runs counter to social expectations that may in some cases be fairly strong" (p. 572). The same pattern of expectation, obviously, strengthens the drift of women toward the humanities. Terman's gifted students and recent National Scholarship winners showed preferences for humanities, if they were women; 35% of the NMS women, but only 12% of the men, took up humanities subjects in college (pp. 565-566). "The groups reporting the most fears, worries, conflicts, and the like are almost always in the literary or fine arts fields....Shall we hypothesize, then, that the more 'neurotic' or complex and troubled people are drawn to intangibles or, conversely, that they are repelled by the mundane? There is evidence to support such a hypothesis" (pp. 571-572). Since these speculations relate to undergraduates and, in their present form, are inapplicable to sex-differentiation in humanities graduate groups, it would be foolhardy to do more than suggest the need for further research. See also Robert H. Knapp and Joseph J. Greenbaum, The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953), Chapter VIII.

12. Comparisons by the College of GRE scores registered by native students and by students throughout the nation favor S.F.S.C. graduates. A score on the Humanities Area Test which would put the student in the 87th percentile, nationally, would fall at the 82nd percentile rank on the S.F.S.C. scale. The median rank of the 95th percentile, nationally, shown by the M.A. graduates in humanities, is equivalent to the 94th percentile, S.F.S.C. scale. The 90th percentile, nationally, is comparable to the 85th percentile, locally.

13. One of the graduate men took the examination before mastering the English language sufficiently to cope with it. His one-percentile score is excluded from the tabulation. However, the low percentile rank for another student with a foreign language background is included in the figures. Most of the students took the examination in the first semester of graduate study; a few did not do so until the second term. Comparison of their scores with those of graduating seniors, who set the national norms, may be questionable. Forty-six of the disqualified students had taken the Humanities Area Test by February, 1965. Thus their scores can be compared without extrapolation with the scores of the successful graduates. Fewer of them ranked in the uppermost percentile and more fell in the lower rankings than was the case of those who completed the program. One-third (compared with nearly one-half of the successful graduates) achieved a percentile rank of 95 or higher. Two-thirds (compared with three-fourths) ranked above the 84th percentile. The remainder (37.4%) trailed by ones, twos, or threes, down through each five-point percentile bracket from 80-84 to 50-54. Three scored below the 50th percentile.

14. Berelson's survey of doctoral education, op. cit., p. 141, indicated to him that deans and others connected to Ph.D. programs very often prefer that candidates have additional preparation--but not in the disciplines of the degree they are taking. Rather, they emphasize the values of supplementary

preparation in the humanities and other general studies areas. Yet, as noted below in Chapter IV, admission to doctoral programs is principally contingent upon the student's preparation in the specialized field of graduate study he elects.

15. The humanities faculty considers history a humanities subject; it is accepted as an appropriate subject for courses taken to fulfill undergraduate and graduate requirements in humanities programs at the College; several of the faculty have doctor's degrees in part or wholly in history. The paucity of history A.B.s entering the program may be a matter worth investigating locally and in comparison with other general humanities programs. Knapp, op. cit., pp. 156-157, observes that history students and faculty seemed to him to be the most stable and firmly-oriented participants in humanistic scholarship, despite some differences among them regarding the sometimes-rival claims of the social sciences versus the humanities. If Knapp is correct, and if the social science emphasis is increasing among historians, then history would not be likely to produce many candidates for an interdisciplinary humanities program. With regard to the contribution of the fine arts to the program's students, further information also would be of interest. As Knapp points out, pp. 157-158, graduate studies in the arts are late developments, relatively speaking, and they often include creative or performance emphases. Locally, a strong performance-oriented creative arts program has just recently been expanded to include significant concern with art history and criticism at the graduate level. In any case, the tendency of graduate students is to choose fields which they believe they already fit, just as "various disciplines tend to recruit adherents in their own image": Sanford, op. cit., pp. 588-599.

16. A comparison would be risky, but it should be noted that the "improvers" discussed here seem somewhat like the Vassar College alumnae who were identified as "Underachievers with Family Orientation." In contrast to those undergraduates who were characterized as "Social" or "Peer-Group Oriented," the Underachievers showed "that the processes of learning or broadening of outlook had not terminated or even slowed down markedly after college." The docile, hard-working "Overachiever" undergraduates were intellectually inactive, after graduation. The "High Achievers" were narrow, although active, in intellectual interests as alumnae: Sanford, op. cit., pp. 868-869.

III. The Character and Quality of the Graduate Work of the Masters of Arts in Humanities

Most of the 47 men and women who earned the M.A. in humanities between 1957 and 1965 studied in a relatively "open" program. Unless they entered after September, 1963, they took more courses by choice than by requirement. All had at least 12 units in graduate humanities seminars, only one of which involved (limited) choice. They completed the required 30-unit program with elective courses in literature and philosophy, one of which was a graduate seminar. Some were allowed to substitute an additional graduate humanities course for one of the literature or philosophy electives. However, to protect the validity of the special-subject groups, only one such substitution was allowed. It most frequently occurred in the philosophy "block," since the College offered no graduate work in that subject prior to 1964.

Candidates who entered in Fall semester, 1963, pursued less diversified study plans. They took 15 units in required humanities "core" seminars, 9 units by choice from a limited group of humanities options, and 6 units in one of the specialized humanities subjects. A few candidates, caught in mid-stream by the 1963 program revision, retained credit for all work taken under the early plan and adopted the new plan for their remaining requirements. The result was to reduce the number of specialized courses and increase the number of humanities seminars in their programs.

Generalizations are only approximations with regard to the elective course work of the 47 graduates. However, despite the great variety which this part of the study plan permitted, some tendencies emerged. The most commonly chosen literature courses were those on specific periods or particular literary forms. For their courses in philosophy, the candidates most frequently selected those in the history of philosophy and religion. Graduate seminars outside the Humanities Department were usually taken in English. The principle of choice which advisers and candidates normally agreed on was that of the relevance of elective courses to legitimate goals of the total humanities program. The more common versions of this principle were:

1. The choice of literature and criticism, rather than writing or language analysis courses; and of courses in philosophic ideas, systems, or great figures, rather than logic.
2. Supplement and extension of undergraduate preparation in a single subject, aiming toward the demonstration of advanced competence in a graduate seminar.
3. Support of interests generated by the program as a whole. Where such interests appeared to be too sharply-delimited to reinforce the total plan of work, they were encouraged as extra-curricular inquiries but were not allowed to dominate the elective course groups. Nor were students encouraged to seek courses which they supposed would help them "pass the examination." On the one hand, the faculty believed that independent study of the examination master-

works was an important feature of the total learning plan. (Hence, therefore, the 1963 decision that faculty assistance in this matter would be provided by informal "sponsorship" rather than by a course devoted to cramming). On the other hand, an investment of one-tenth of the entire program in, say, Melville, might be justified for a number of educational reasons, but not merely by the candidate's desire to "pass Moby-Dick" in the comprehensive examination.

Despite the cogency of the principle of relevance, the diversity of the study plans of the M.A. graduates often created uneasiness among students, observers, and faculty. Consequently, there appeared to be a drift of the students toward integrated and away from multidisciplinary study. Not a few arranged to substitute a humanities seminar for one of the courses required in a specialized subject, an adjustment permitted but not solicited by the department. Twenty-three (49%) of the M.A. graduates thus showed an extra graduate humanities seminar in their degree programs. Sometimes such a seminar offset the requirement for a graduate course in philosophy or English. Nineteen students (40%) took more graduate seminars than the program required (15 units, minimum), and seventeen (36%) took more graduate seminars than was demanded in a subject outside the department. On the whole, then, the drift toward integrated courses, while perceptible, did not seriously dilute the specialized component of the program nor soften the requirement for seminar study.¹

Typically, the successful graduates took more than three semesters to earn the degree. Many were part-time students and many took more than the minimum amount of course work required by the program. Occasionally, a student needed extra time to offset a poor course grade, prepare for the final examination, or (in two out of eight cases), repeat the examination. Over half (25) of the candidates took more than 30 units of post-A.B. course work, and for 22 students the M.A. program itself exceeded the minimum of 30 units.²

Table VI

Period of Study and Units Earned by
Graduates of the M.A. Program

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
Academic years of graduate study to earn M.A. degree	1.5-6.5	2.5	2.0
Number of post-A.B. units earned	30-84	35	33
Number of units earned to com- plete the M.A. program	30-41	32	31

Thus many of the M.A. graduates continued their habits of broad and extensive study. The same momentum appeared in the quality of their work. The mean and median of the graduates' post-A.B. grades were superior to those of their undergraduate years, and they were well above the 3.0 minimum required for a graduate degree.³

Table VII

Scope and Quality of Graduate Course Work

A. Grade Point Averages in Graduate Course Work

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Grade point average in all post-A.B. course work in humanities subjects	2.84-3.90	3.36	3.38	3.33
Grade point average in courses counted for the M.A. program	3.00-3.90	3.39	3.38	3.52

B. Units and Grade Point Averages in Courses in Humanities and in Other Subjects

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Humanities (integrated) courses in post-A.B. study:				
Units earned	*6-32	18	18	15
Grade point average	3.0-4.0	3.36	3.34	3.0
Courses other than humanities (integrated) in post-A.B. study:				
Units earned	6-63	16	15	12
Grade point average	2.4-3.8	3.34	3.34	3.0

*The first student to earn the M.A. in humanities entered the program after he had nearly completed the requirements for the M.A. in English; much of that course work was credited toward the M.A. in humanities.

C. Units and Grade Point Averages in the Specialized Humanities Subjects

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
English			
Units	3-57	11	9
Grade point average (Undergraduate grade point average)	2.5-4.0	3.36	3.4
		(3.05)	(3.0)
Literature other than English			
Units	3-12	4	3
Grade point average (Undergraduate grade point average)	3.0-4.0	3.73	4.0
		(3.25)	(3.25)
History			
Units	3-6	4	3
Grade point average (Undergraduate grade point average)	2.0-4.0	3.16	3.0
		(2.82)	(3.0)
Philosophy			
Units	3-12	5	6
Grade point average (Undergraduate grade point average)	2.0-4.0	3.27	3.0
		(3.04)	(3.0)
Fine Arts			
Units	3-4	3	3
Grade point average (Undergraduate grade point average)	2.0-4.0	3.50	4.0
		(2.98)	(3.0)

Statistical averages of units and grade points leave much to be desired as indices of qualitative achievement in graduate study. It is proper to assume that the M.A. graduates' records represent their relatively high levels of intelligence, skill in discourse and writing, initiative and reliability in learning, and, in the humanities program, their successful attacks on integrative problems. But in what degrees and in what combinations these qualities appeared can only be surmised on the basis of grade point averages. Nevertheless, analysis of such data suggests possible or probable relationships among a number of interesting aspects of the graduates' achievements: relations between undergraduate background and graduate scholarship; between the new humanities courses and conventional single-subject disciplines; between grades and sex; and between the course work of the program and the comprehensive examination. The greatest attention has been given to those whose grade point averages deviated from the middle range. The students above undoubtedly demonstrated superior qualities of intention and scholarship. Those below the average, while successful in graduate study, would have

earned no more than two grades of A, at most; the larger number had only one or none.⁴ For purposes of analysis, various attributes of the graduates were plotted against their grade record in the master's program. Table VIII displays these data on students with above- and below-average graduate grade point records.

Table VIII

Personal and Academic Background of Graduates
in the Lower and Higher Ranges of
Grade Point Averages

	<u>Total Group</u> (N = 47)	<u>Graduates with</u> <u>3.00-3.25 Grade</u> <u>Point Average</u> <u>in M.A. Program</u> (N = 15)	<u>Graduates with</u> <u>3.50-3.90 Grade</u> <u>Point Average</u> <u>in M.A. Program</u> (N = 19)
Sex			
Male	75%	93%	63%
Female	25%	7%	37%
Age			
Mean	32	30	32
Median	30	27	32
Source of A.B.			
S.F.S.C.	30%	40%	32%
All Bay Area institutions	66%	68%	80%
Subjects of A.B. major			
English and philosophy	43%	33%	42%
All humanities subjects	72%	86%	63%
Undergraduate grade point average in humanities subjects			
2.25-2.49	6.5%	13.3%	11%
2.50-2.99	32.5%	53.0%	21%
3.00-3.49	43.5%	26.7%	42%
3.50-3.99	17.5%	7.0%	26%
GRE Humanities Area			
Test %ile ranks			
95-99plus	47%	20%	58%
90-99plus	66%	40%	74%
85-99plus	75%	60%	74%
Academic years taken to earn M.A. degree			
Mean	2.5	2.0	2.5
Median and mode	2.0	2.0	2.0

There appears to be little variance between the total group and its subdivisions in such matters as the subjects of undergraduate preparation and the years spent in the M.A. program. However, in age, it would appear that the younger students were more likely to earn the lower grade point averages. The displacement of women away from the lower grade ranges is not quite as pronounced in the graduate as in the undergraduate record. All Bay Area institutions contributed students to both the lower and higher achievement subdivisions. Relatively, however, "native" students seem not to have won high grade averages quite as often as those from other institutions in the region. From the distribution of undergraduate grade point averages, it is evident that preparatory records below and above 3.00 were correlated with below- and above-average graduate grade records. This relationship prevailed for two-thirds of the students with 3.00-3.25 or 3.50-3.90 graduate grade point averages. Less frequently, the Humanities Area Test ranking and the grade point average were analogous. Tables IX-XII direct further attention to these relationships. As well, they compare certain characteristics of students below the mean grade point average, with those of students near or above the mean.

Table IX

Fields of Undergraduate Major Relative to
Grade Point Averages in M.A. Program

	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>3.0-3.25 Grade Point Average</u>	<u>3.26 and Higher Grade Point Average</u>
A.B. major in humanities subjects	37	13	24
A.B. major in subject out- side humanities area	10	2	8

Table X

Grade Point Averages in M.A. Program
of Men and Women

A. Comparison of Grade Point Averages

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
Men	3.0-3.9	3.35	3.36
Women	3.08-3.81	3.49	3.45

B. Distribution of Grade Point Averages in M.A. Program, by Sex

	Men			Women		
	F.	Cum.	F.	F.	Cum.	F.
3.00-3.24	14	14		1	1	
3.25-3.49	9	23		4	5	
3.50-3.74	10	33		5	10	
3.75-plus	2	35		2	12	

Table XI

Students with Below-Average Undergraduate and Graduate Grade Point Averages*

<u>Number with Undergraduate Grade Point Averages below 3.00 in Humanities Subjects</u>	<u>Number with Graduate Grade Point Averages 3.00-3.25 in M.A. Program</u>
Below 2.75	5
2.75-2.99	5

*Mean undergraduate grade point average in humanities subjects for the 47 graduates = 3.07; mean for the graduate M.A. program = 3.39.

Table XII

Graduate Record Examination Ranks Relative to Grade Point Averages in M.A. Program

<u>Percentile Rank on Humanities Area Test*</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>3.0-3.25 Grade Point Average in M.A. Program</u>	<u>3.25 and higher Grade Point Average in M.A. Program</u>
-80	10	4	6
80-84	1	1	0
85-89	4	3	1
90-94	9	4	5
95-99 plus	22	3	19

*national scale, men and women

Interpretative comments on the data shown in the preceding tables must be cautious, because of the small size of the samples or the limited degrees of variance. Yet it is of interest to note the effectiveness of students whose undergraduate background had not included a humanities subject major. From Table VIII it can be calculated that 37% of the students with 3.50 or higher grade point averages came from undergraduate majors outside the humanities area. Table IX shows that of all such students, only two did not attain a grade point average above or near the mean. It is also noteworthy that women, although constituting only one-quarter of the 47 graduates, accounted for over one-third of the number earning high grade point averages (Table VIII). Half of the women, but only one-third of the men, were in the 3.50 and above grade point average group (Table X). Only one of the 12 women, compared to 14 of the 35 men, failed to receive grades averaging above 3.25.

Of great interest is the evidence that a large number of the students distinctly improved in their scholarly achievements, judging by the difference between their undergraduate and graduate grade point averages.⁵ Two-thirds of the graduates in the 3.00-3.25 range of master's program grades had not previously attained a 3.00 record. Moreover, of the students in the 3.50 and above grade range, only one-fourth had had equivalent undergraduate grade point averages (Table VIII). It is true, however, that some students earned graduate grade averages which were lower than their undergraduate record. Too, it appears that students with undergraduate grade averages below 2.75, or ranks below the 90th percentile in the Humanities Area Test had less than a fifty-fifty chance of earning better than below-average (though tolerable) graduate grade records (Tables XI and XII). Further, as noted already in connection with Table VIII, in two-thirds of the cases of above- and below-average graduate grade records, there appears a comparable division above and below the 3.00 point of undergraduate grade averages. Several inferences may be drawn. It appears that the technical skills, intelligence, learning, and attitudes reflected in undergraduate grade records were very often more fully developed or were more commendably demonstrated in the humanities graduate program. It also seems that in a large number of instances, the differences between students in terms of undergraduate grade point averages corresponded to differences between them in terms of graduate grade records. Students who had not shown much more than average academic capacities as undergraduates were very likely to present adequate, but less than average achievements as graduate students. Conversely, insofar as scholarly qualities in humanities were epitomized by grades, many of the best graduates had been the best undergraduates.

Heightened motivation may well have played an important role in producing the improvement in academic records which many of the graduates displayed. While in the program, not a few said that they felt the requirements of a typical undergraduate major had been restrictive. They were denied adequate opportunity to exploit other interests. But as graduates in the humanities program, these students were stimulated by the opportunity to employ their various talents. They utilized the breadth and diversity of their prior studies and interests.

More specifically, the goal-orientation of prospective teachers and of those hoping to go on to doctoral study apparently helped many to improve upon earlier achievements. For example, all those improving from below a 2.75 undergraduate grade point average to above 3.25 in the master's program

(Table XI) became teachers or Ph.D. candidates. Four of the five who attained an M.A. grade record higher than 3.25, after an undergraduate average between 2.75 and 2.99, became teachers. On the other hand, six of the 10 with an undergraduate average below 3.0 and with an M.A. average below 3.26 did not go into an academic career. All but one of those in the sub-80th percentile ranks on the Humanities Area Test became teachers after earning an average or above average graduate grade point record. The one student in the 85-89 percentile bracket on the GRE scale earned a grade average above 3.25 in M.A. work and went into teaching. And among graduates in the plus-3.25 grade group who had not scored above the 79th percentile on the GRE, half became teachers and half went into Ph.D. programs after receiving the M.A. degree.⁶

Two aspects of the master's program were selected for special attention in evaluating the scope and quality of the successful candidates' achievements. One was the relative effectiveness of their work in single-subject courses and in the integrative humanities seminars. The other was their performance on the final comprehensive examination. The current program emphasizes these aspects more than did the earlier curriculum. Hence it seems important to consider whether the experience of the first group of graduates sheds light on future developments.

Two questions were asked regarding the graduates' work in the humanities seminars. How did their records in these courses compare with those of the entire master's program. And what preparation and background of the M.A. graduates were associated with above- and below-average records in the seminars? Table XIII summarizes the data on these points. It appears from these data that the graduates usually did at least as well in the entire program as they did in humanities seminars. Alternatively it can be said that in the literature-philosophy blocks of study they showed records as high or higher than those displayed in the integrated courses (see also Table VII). The work of these graduates thus suggests that performance in the core humanities seminars is an indicator of probably overall achievement. Two inferences arise from the data on the backgrounds of candidates with above- and below-average grade point averages in humanities seminars. First, it would appear that no exceptional advantage is gained from single-subject preparation in English and philosophy or, indeed, from other humanities subjects. In integrational courses, evidently, the breadth of outlook which the student possesses, rather than the details of his training, is of major importance. Second, the student's capacity for advanced study, insofar as it is indicated by the undergraduate grade record and the rank on the Humanities Area Test, is analogous to the quality of his record in the integrative seminars (as it is in the total master's program).

Table XIII

Background and Grade Point Average of
Students in Humanities Seminars

	<u>Number Earning Grade</u> <u>Point Averages of</u> <u>3.25 or Lower in</u> <u>Humanities Seminars</u> <u>(N = 20)</u>	<u>Number Earning Grade</u> <u>Point Averages of</u> <u>3.50 or Higher in</u> <u>Humanities Seminars</u> <u>(N = 15)</u>
Grade point average in total M.A. program		
3.00-3.24	16	0
3.25-3.49	2	4
3.50-3.74	2	5
3.75-3.99	0	6
Major fields of A.B.		
English and philosophy	7	5
All humanities subjects	17	9
Undergraduate grade point average in humanities subjects		
2.25-2.49	2	0
2.50-2.99	9	5
3.00-3.24	4	5
3.25-3.49	2	2
3.50-3.74	1	2
3.75-3.99	2	1
Percentile rank on GRE Humanities Area Test		
-65 %ile	6	1
65-79 %ile	0	2
80-89 %ile	4	0
90-94 %ile	4	3
95-99 %ile	6	9

These inferences seem to be sustained by data on the graduates who received the grade of C in one of the humanities courses. Since such a misfortune immediately places a candidate in jeopardy, it is important to see it in the context of his total record. The matter is of interest, also, if the work of the 47 M.A. graduates is to be thought predictive of the records others will produce in the future. From the data shown below in Table XIV it can be seen that the few students who had serious difficulty in a seminar were also likely to have below-average grade records for the entire M.A. program. As far as their background was concerned, there was a 50% chance that their undergraduate grade averages and Humanities Area Test rankings were below the average for the total group of 47 graduates. A third of these students, however,

compensated for their deficiency and ended among the average or above-average graduates, in terms of their total grade point records.⁷

Table XIV

Background and Grade Point Averages of
Students with a C-Grade in a
Humanities Seminar

	<u>Number</u>
Grade point average in total	
M.A. program	
3.00-3.24	4
3.25-3.49	1
3.50-3.99	1
Major fields of A.B.	
English and philosophy	3
All humanities subjects	3
Undergraduate grade point aver- age in humanities subjects	
2.25-2.74*	3
3.00-3.49*	3
Percentile rank on GRE	
Humanities Area Test	
-65 %ile	2
80-84 %ile**	1
90-94 %ile	1
95-99 %ile	2

*none 2.75-2.99, or above 3.49

**none in 65-79 or 85-89 percentiles

Eight of the 47 graduates took a final written and oral examination covering sets of master-works in the humanities (see Chapter I, above). Judging by data on their sex, age, undergraduate background, and graduate grade records (Table XV), the eight were fairly typical of the entire group of 47.⁸ It is interesting to note, however, the relative youthfulness of the first group of examinees (compared to the entire group of graduates), and the fact that the two who had difficulty appeared to have had stronger undergraduate and graduate records than the six who passed the examination on their first trial. However, until more candidates have taken the examination, critical inferences regarding the relation of the examination to other aspects of the program must be deferred.⁹

Table XV

Background and Academic Record of Eight Examinees

	<u>First Time Pass</u>	<u>Second Time Pass</u>
Sex		
Men	5	1
Women	1	1
Mean age	27	28
Undergraduate background:		
Mean of units in humanities subjects	44	62
Mean of grade point average in humanities subjects	2.98	3.08
Mean of percentile ranks in GRE Humanities Area Test	88	80*
Mean of M.A. program grade point averages	3.26	3.44

*the mean of 61 and 90 percentile ranks

This appraisal of the graduates' work in the master's program suggests two final observations. First, although the majority of the successful students achieved records above minimal expectations, some were never far from a disqualifying lower limit. Among these candidates were those with excessive commitments to employment; those with the capacity for respectable but never brilliant performances; and a few with academic backgrounds or skills which were comparatively and persistently weak. The possibility that a few candidates were unduly favored or inhibited by particular faculty members can probably be ruled out. In the first place, there were (and are) variations in outlook among the faculty with respect to the nature of integrational and interdisciplinary studies, although all are fully committed to them. In the second place, the faculty has avoided rigid categorization with respect to the seminars they teach. During the period under consideration, several instructors taught three of the seminars. The matching of a single instructor with a particular seminar occurred only in two cases. One consequence of this "congregational" plan of staffing was that candidates stood a very good chance of "evening out" any variations in instruction which might have been especially favorable or unfavorable to them. Another result was that students who took the same seminar in successive terms might have encountered somewhat different forms of interdisciplinary scholarship. And in the third place, a large part of the candidates' work was scattered among courses elected on an individual basis from the offerings of several departments.

With regard to below-average candidates, decisions are sometimes perplexing and painful. What minimal standards should prevail in a new and relatively unconventional graduate program? What allowances should be made for external factors which affect the academic process? What benefits of doubt should be provided in specific instances in order not to jeopardize excessively the total progress of a candidate?

The records of the first 47 graduates offer some hints regarding the disposition of the marginal and below-average candidates. It appears from data shown heretofore that most of them were improvers, even though many did not rise much above the minimum line of competence expected of graduate students. It also appears that the extent of improvement very often was related to the average level of achievement the candidate had established as an undergraduate. On the basis of such patterns, it should now be possible to estimate whether difficulty in a specific case was likely to be an anomaly or a new instance of a persisting condition. In the latter event, the data also indicates that the benefit of doubt (or hope) which might be conferred in judging a candidate's performance would be relatively vain, if expectations of marked improvement were the basis for latitude. Whether the faculty's management of such problematic cases continues to be relatively tolerant, experimental, and within minimal limits, successful, remains a question for subsequent evaluative inquiry.¹⁰

The second concluding observation concerns the possible use of data herein to stabilize the characteristics of the humanities master's program and the candidates who pursue it. Most of the first 47 graduates completed a curriculum which since has been modified (see Chapter I). Continuities exist between the former and the current programs. All things considered, the records of the first graduates can be used to suggest some expectations for the future. Yet as time goes on, different patterns of instruction and performance may emerge which cannot entirely be foreshadowed by the data now available. To use such data to improve the program and to enhance the quality of the candidates' education is one thing. To cut off possibilities of new discoveries about the program and the differential responses to it of successful students is another. Much of the data thus far presented would be less informative had it arisen from the records of a less varied group of students. Further experimental growth of the program may depend upon the continued presence of a fairly heterogeneous student population.¹¹

It is equally important to consider that no faculty and few, if any students have thought that the humanities program is an end in itself, or that humanistic education ends on Commencement Day. Fully to know and to evaluate the education and academic behavior of the first 47 graduates, then, it is necessary to consider their post-graduate careers. The data seem to show meaningful relationships between the preparation and background of the successful students and their various achievements as graduates. The question needs be asked whether such relationships continue into the post-graduate years. With this question in mind, information has been gathered on the ways the graduates are using their education, and on their attitudes toward the M.A. program in humanities, seen in retrospect and in both ideal and practical perspectives.

* * * *

Notes

1. Here are three representative M.A. programs; the third reflects the "new" program instituted in 1963. Course titles only are shown; each course is assigned three units. Graduate seminars are marked with an asterisk.

- A. *Intro. to Graduate Study in Humanities
 - *Artistic Experience in the Humanities
 - *Literary Experience in the Humanities
 - *Problems of Integration in the Humanities
 - Individual Authors: Henry James
 - *Comedy
 - *Sixteenth Century
 - Theory of Values
 - History of Western Religions
 - Philosophical Basis of the Musical Experience
 - (Offered by the Humanities Department; here substituted for a third course in philosophy, traditionally defined).
- B. *Intro. to Graduate Study in Humanities
 - *Artistic Experience in the Humanities
 - *Literary Experience in the Humanities
 - *Philosophical Experience in the Humanities
 - *Problems of Integration in the Humanities
 - American Literature, 1607-1860
 - Modern English and American Drama
 - History of Ancient Philosophy
 - History of Modern Philosophy
 - Styles of Cultural Expression
 - Great Figures in the Humanities
- C. *Artistic Experience in the Humanities
 - *Philosophical Experience in the Humanities
 - *Historical Experience in the Humanities
 - *Problems of Integration in the Humanities
 - *Special Study in Humanities (in lieu of the required seminar on literature in the humanities in a term when the course was not available)
 - The Modern American Novel
 - Greek and Roman Theater and Drama
 - Philosophical Basis of the Musical Experience
 - Modern Era in Western Culture (two-semester course)

2. Reckoning time from the first through the last semester in which the candidate worked on his program, there would be two semesters and a summer session per academic year in which the candidate could enroll. It is said, at the College, that a program of nine units per semester is realistic for most students. Those without financial or other encumbrances might take 12; many would take 3 or 6 units per term to allow time to earn their livings. Note 3, Chapter II above, gives comparable information on doctoral candidates as well as on a sample all-College group of M.A. candidates. Eighteen months elapsed time for earning the master's degree seems to be a national norm; in some quarters it is thought that the degree ought not to take more than a year of a

student's time: Walters, op. cit., pp. 90-92. In reporting units taken, no account was taken of any which were earned toward the requirements in professional education (including student teaching), if the individual were a credential candidate.

3. In a College-wide sample of 117 students enrolled in graduate programs from 1963 to 1965, the mean grade point average for all post-A.B. work taken at the College was 3.24, not counting the 14% of the sample whose average fell below 3.0. The median for the group (excluding the substandard 14%) was 3.2-3.3. Twenty-nine percent of the total group earned a grade average of 3.5 or higher; 24% had an average of 3.0-3.2. It will be noted that both of these subdivisions is proportionately smaller than the above- and below-average subdivisions of the humanities graduates (see Table VIII above). However, if the students in the all-College sample whose grades averaged below 3.0 are added to those below 3.3, then it should be said that the humanities graduate group included more above-average and fewer below-average students than the all-College sample.

4. Assuming variables in the grading process, as well as indistinctness in regard to qualitative or behavioral referents for grades, the analysis and discussion concerns students whose grade point averages clearly fall on either side of the statistical mean of the total group. A student in the 3.00-3.25 group who happens to earn one more grade of A will approach the mean of the total group, but he will not enter the 3.50-and above subdivision. Conversely, the student who adds a third B to an otherwise A-record will still be distinct from the average. Thus attention is given herein to the students whose pattern of work shows predominant features, whatever the mixture of specific qualities.

5. One other conceivable inference has been rejected as improbable: that no difference in quality really existed in the student's undergraduate and graduate work, but that A's were given to graduate students doing B work, and B's for C. It is possible that a graduate student in an upper division undergraduate course might have a competitive advantage which was reflected in his grade. If this situation regularly and consistently redounded to the graduates' favor, then marked disparity would be seen between their graduate seminar grades and their other grades. Such is not the case, however. A further indication of the relative authenticity of the record is provided by the extra-mural evaluation of the graduates who subsequently presented themselves as applicants for doctoral study or for employment as teachers. There is no indication that they were looked upon or performed as if they were only overgrown undergraduates with inflated grade point averages.

6. The question of which came first, improvement in academic prospects or selection of teaching (or doctoral study) as a goal, is moot in some cases. However, during the first four years the program existed, the College was authorized to offer the M.A. only in conjunction with a teacher credential. More or less seriously, thus, the candidates were initially aimed toward an educational career. Thereafter, most of those who took up the credential program declared their intention of doing so at the time they applied for entrance into the master's program. A few were undecided at the outset but made their decision within a term. Those who went on to Ph.D. work were usually less certain to begin with, although some deliberately took up the M.A. as an intermediate step and hoped to continue their studies afterward if financial and

other circumstances were favorable. Others were encouraged to entertain the possibility of doctoral work as a result of their experience in the M.A. program. In the main, it is clear that the educational goal became significant early enough to affect much, if not all, of the students' work in the master's program.

7. The records of students currently in the program and of those who graduated after January, 1965, confirm this conclusion. Those who have a C grade in a humanities seminar, in more cases than not, have difficulty earning compensating A grades whether in other humanities courses or in courses outside the department. Such students will need to take an additional seminar to produce a 30-unit M.A. program that meets the 3.0 minimum grade point average requirement. To meet the all-College requirement that post-A.B. work of every kind must result in a 3.0 (or higher) grade point average, the student will still need to compensate for his C grade in some other course, whether it is counted in the M.A. program or not. Persistent deficiency can lead to departmental action to terminate candidacy.

8. The eight examinees had taken slightly less than the average amount of undergraduate course work in humanities subjects, and their grade point average in the graduate program was very slightly below average (3.30 compared to 3.39). A deviation from the norm also occurred in the mean of the period spent in graduate study (1.5 compared to 2.5 academic years).

9. The variables in the final examination are too numerous to permit confident analysis of anything but a very large sample. Assuming that some of them could be identified in terms of a candidate's preparation, grades, time spent in study, etc., there would still remain such factors as his temperamental response to extreme stress, his skill at extemporaneous writing and discourse, and his accumulated (as distinct from semester-by-semester) intellectual maturity. Too, the results of the examination are affected by the composition of the examining committee, its facility at discovering the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, and its collective approach to the subjects of the examination (the master-works which the candidate has chosen).

The effect of the "sponsorship" plan on other aspects of the candidate's work, including the final examination, could not be investigated with any assurance. Only three students entered the program in time to take advantage of it. One did so while preparing to retake the examination, faithfully travelling 150 miles once a month for a year to meet with her sponsor. The other two were less heroically involved but apparently found the tutorial relationship interesting and helpful. Informal comments and observations from the current students are inconclusive. The plan appears vulnerable to other, more formal claims on the participants' energies unless both parties perceive it as a value-laden opportunity rather than merely as a peripheral requirement. Generally, interest in the plan seems less attached to its practical relation to the final examination than to its continuous possibilities for intensive study of humanistic works, issues, and ideas.

10. Inasmuch as the data seem to show that a few candidates are persistently marginal, even though they may muddle through the program, the following changes in policy might be considered:

(a) Periodic surveys of the candidates' cumulative record to locate those who have repeatedly received "benefit of doubt" grades of B or B-minus, with provisions for aiding the student or interrupting his progress in the program pending improvement.

(b) Institution of an entrance requirement which draws a cut-off line at 2.75 grade point average in humanities subjects, or the 90th percentile in the GRE Humanities Area Test; or a combination of these two indices which allows each some power to offset the other. The data thus far assembled suggest that such a line probably divides the more from the less promising students. However, since the study also shows that adequate, sometimes quite effective students came from the applicants who fell below the suggested line, conditional admission instead of outright denial of an application would seem appropriate for the submarginal individual.

(c) Rapid and certain action to eliminate graduates who fall below the prescribed 3.0 minimum grade point average, with conditions for re-entrance after fulfillment of appropriate remedial assignments in a specified period of time. Such a policy would be educationally conservative by removing weak students from the program before they had invested an excessive amount of time and energy in failure. Its re-entry feature, however, would reduce the possibility that a single false step might have unjustifiably severe or enduring consequences. To acknowledge variations in outlook and judgment among instructors, such action might be reserved for a standing departmental committee.

(d) More comprehensive attention to the candidates' progress by their advisers and sponsors, through conferences and informal communication which would supplement the less illuminating record composed by course grades. Strong candidates might thus be more rapidly recognized; those struggling to improve upon minimal achievements might be more continuously assisted.

(e) Readier recourse to the departmental policy that candidates may retake the final examination if they do not pass it on the first trial. Students preparing themselves might thus be especially stimulated by knowing that a "retake" decision was not uncommon. Those who might unduly strain the committee's judgment to pass at the borderline would be required to remedy their weakness before returning to a second, and very likely successful, examination.

11. Cf. Sanford, op. cit., pp. 588-589. In such a program, the value of an "open market" for varying interests, viewpoints, and personalities in both students and faculty would seem particularly great. Generally, the tendency is for both to drift toward a common set of traits and to present a coherent "image" to themselves and others. An impressionistic glimpse of both the congruence and variation in outlook and evaluation emerged when five of the faculty were asked in February, 1966, to look back at the first 47 M.A. graduates. One of the faculty had been a student and part-time instructor during part of the period 1957-1965; the others had been on the staff throughout the first eight years. They were asked to check the names of the students they did not recall sufficiently or had not encountered. Only nine of the students were recalled by all five faculty. However, 32 (66%) of them were checked by at least three of the faculty as being in the lower, middle, or upper one-third of graduate students, rated in terms of the qualities desired of humanities

masters of arts. The numerical values of 3.12, 3.37, and 3.62 were adopted to represent the mean grade point average of the lower, middle, and higher subdivisions. On this basis, the mean grade point average for the students rated by three or more of the faculty was 3.37, compared to the actual mean average of 3.39 for the total group of M.A. graduates (see Table VII, above). In the cases where three or more faculty rated a student, three out of three agreed in four instances; three or four out of four, in four cases; and three or four out of five, in eight cases. In the instances where the number of ratings might have allowed a spread over two or all three of the qualitative subdivisions, 11 students were given the same evaluation by the faculty who rated them; 24 were rated in two adjacent subdivisions; and 5 had ratings in all three subdivisions. Summarizing, in half the cases where three or more faculty rated a student, three agreed or constituted the majority in identifying the student as approximately below-average, average, or above-average. In most of the remaining cases, the ratings involved adjacent evaluative ranges. Approximately the same results occurred when the actual earned grade point average of students rated by three or more faculty were compared with the average calculated by using the arbitrary values assigned to the faculty ratings. On this basis most of the faculty's ratings tended to be close to or somewhat higher than the actual earned grade point average, as if, in retrospect, some of the students seemed stronger than they once had appeared, or as if the humanities faculty were concerned with aspects of the students' performance which were not as often emphasized by other instructors in different and specialized fields, wherein the candidates took approximately half their courses.

IV. The Post-Graduate Careers of the
Master of Arts Graduates:
Non-Academic Vocations and Doctoral Study

With few exceptions the 47 Master of Arts graduates in humanities continued to be active members of the academic community after they earned their degrees. In 1965 half held high school or college positions and one-fifth were enrolled in Ph.D. programs. Many of the remainder were on the verge of, or were in close relationships to academic pursuits. No portrait of the graduates would be complete, therefore, unless it represented their sustained intellectual and educational commitments.

To secure information on the graduates' careers, questionnaires were sent them regarding their occupations, post-graduate education, experiences in teaching or doctoral study, and retrospective views of the humanities program. Most of them responded, and by direct and indirect means it was possible to assemble at least minimal data on the current status of 46 of the 47 graduates. Completed questionnaires came back from all but eight, two of whom were "on the move" in Europe.¹

Identified by present and principal occupations, the graduates formed three over-lapping groups. Twenty-three were teachers; nine were candidates for doctoral degrees; and fourteen were engaged in occupations outside the field of education. However, rather arbitrary distinctions were necessary to place some of the graduates in only one of the three groups. Several were "in transit" to or from teaching careers or doctoral study. Some not now in education had taught or were looking forward to teaching.

Each group was studied with regard to the personal and academic traits of its members, their opinions about the effect of their education on their careers, and their afterthoughts on the humanities program itself. In the main, the groups seemed much alike. The ratio of men to women was close to three to one in each. No group was markedly older or younger than the others at the time its members earned the M.A. degree. The means and medians for undergraduate grade point averages in humanities subjects exceeded 3.0 in each group, and the average number of units taken was comparable. The three groups also were similar in the scope and quality of their graduate work. In units taken to earn the M.A., there was little variance, and the mean and median grade point averages were above 3.3 for all three groups. Differences between the groups can, indeed, be discerned by careful scrutiny of their records. But in view of the overlapping boundaries of the groups, their very small size, and the fluid, developmental character of the program, such differences have not been stressed. On the one hand, evidence of interesting comparative tendencies may suggest clues to the factors which led the graduates to take up different careers. But on the other hand, decisive interpretations based on such limited data have been thought premature.²

A. Master of Arts Graduates in Non-Academic Careers

Fourteen men and women with master of arts degrees in humanities were pursuing occupations outside education in 1965, when the present study was completed. Among them was the first to receive the degree and one of the last to do so in the period 1957-1965. The personal and academic profile of this group scarcely deviates from that of the total group of 47 graduates.³

Table XVI

Master of Arts Graduates in Non-Academic Careers

N=14: Men, 10 (71%); Women, 4 (29%)

Figures for total group of 47 shown in parentheses throughout.

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
Undergraduate units in humanities subjects	63 (57)	60 (54)
Undergraduate grade point average in humanities subjects	3.14 (3.07)	3.04 (3.03)
GRE Humanities Area Test %ile rank (national scale)	93 (87)	96 (95)
Age on receipt of M.A. degree	32 (32)	30 (30)
Academic years in graduate study required to earn M.A. degree	2.7 (2.5)	2.0 (2.0)
Post-A.B. course units	36 (35)	32 (33)
Grade point average in M.A. program	3.33 (3.39)	3.32 (3.38)

Six of the M.A. graduates pursuing non-academic careers in 1965 were prospective teachers. Two had nearly completed requirements for the junior college teaching credential. A third had already met credential requirements and was seeking a position. Two of the women, presently concentrating upon their family obligations, planned to begin teaching within the next three years. One had started the junior college credential program and the other had taught part-time prior to marriage. A third woman, hitherto successful in a research, business, and public relations career, had been offered a part-time junior college position for Fall, 1965, with a full-time opportunity in 1966 and possibilities of concomitant doctoral study.

Table XVII

Non-Academic Post-Graduate Occupations

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Preparing to Teach</u>	<u>Planning to Prepare to Teach*</u>	<u>Pursuits Related to Education</u>
Employed in government, construction, banking, misc.	8	2	1?	1
Self-employed	2		1?	
Housewife	2	1	1	
Not employed (including one in travel immediately after earning M.A.)	2	1 (already prepared)	1?	

*Not including three who have taught at the college level and have not ruled out possibility of returning to part or full-time teaching

In addition, two men of the remaining eight in the non-academic career group had taught in junior colleges for several years after earning the M.A. While they were probably permanently settled in business positions in 1965, occasional part-time teaching still interested them. Another man was the administrator and chief instructor of a training program for employees in a system of savings and loan institutions. One of the youngest men in the group entered law school after receiving the M.A., shifted to a government position, and was debating whether to return to a law school, enter

a doctoral program in one of the humanities subjects, or go into teaching. The fourth woman in the group was engaged in a career closely related to education. She directed an important Bay Area library. Her scholarly interests were represented by the fact that she had taken enough course work to have earned a second M.A., had she wished to do so. She also was an officer in the regional chapter of a national learned society.

Most of those in non-academic careers reported that their humanities graduate studies had little relevance to their vocational activities. However, the library director had found her interdisciplinary training very valuable in dealing with the variety of fields of learning and the varied interests of persons she encountered professionally. The man who directs the training program in banking found that his graduate courses offered models for planning his own teaching schedule. Principally, the value of the graduate program for these men and women was private, rather than vocational. They stated that their studies had decisively advanced their philosophical and religious conceptions, their critical faculties, and the scope and quality of private humanistic studies. The number who traced to the graduate program a new or greater attachment to the arts was especially notable.⁴

Despite their separation from the academic milieu, these graduates offered interesting suggestions for strengthening the M.A. program. Several emphasized the importance of integrative studies and commended the 1963 revision which gave humanities seminars a greater place in the curriculum. One proposed the introduction of comparative study in Eastern and Western cultures. Another called attention to little-used opportunities in the Bay Area community for contemporary humanities scholarship, especially in the arts. Two very justly deplored the relatively little attention to music in the program. They suggested that this imbalance in the study of the arts should be redressed.⁵

There were few negative comments on the program. One graduate felt that his seminars had been insufficiently rigorous. Faculty and students were too easily satisfied. The other critic reacted strongly against the foreign language proficiency requirement which had been introduced after his time. He feared it represented an intrusion of conventional academic "busy work," which would cost the program some of the freshness which had appealed to him.⁶

Among the comments of the graduates in non-academic vocations are the following, which are selective, though fair, reflections of their retrospective views:

"I was primarily interested in keeping mentally alive by considering, reconsidering, and discussing some of the major creations of the human spirit. The studies helped me to keep my balance during a delicate transitional period by serving as an antidote to the infectious crudities of business life. I hope they will assist me to cope with all present and future problems in a rational, creative way."

* * * *

"The one apparent deficiency within the Master's program is that the program does not include a core seminar in music. Although my judgment may suffer from a personal bias, I find the absence of music conspicuous, especially since the college possesses one of the world's outstanding and definitive music collections /the De Bellis collection/. Secondly, I feel that the Humanities Department is best equipped to provide interdisciplinary analysis of this material. In addition, candidates entering the teaching profession are at a serious disadvantage by not being trained to deal with musical materials."

* * * *

"From my own experience in the various seminar classes, I know that students are often much better prepared in one or another of the various Humanistic disciplines....It might be beneficial, particularly for students who enter the field of Humanities only on the graduate level, to have intense courses which offer much material in a concentrated form on the particular subject of the seminar.... This might be done by offering reading lists or by discussion-reading groups which could be supervised either by a graduate assistant or by one of the faculty members.... I feel very strongly that the /final/ examination should be a subsidiary activity of the Humanities Master's program instead of the be-all and end-all of the student's academic work during that time... Since... it is being incorporated as an integral part of the student's academic endeavors, and since he will be working continually with the Sponsor, the examination should not be an impossible hurdle for most students. Perhaps a trial examination could be given the student after one semester of study. Such an examination could indicate to the Sponsor and a student alike where the most work is needed....If, at this time, he is unable to cope with the work that would be expected of him, then he should be encouraged to discontinue his work, at least until the time when he is better qualified. Those students who are successful with this initial examination can then feel better able to understand what will be expected of them in the Master's Examination at the end of the academic program. They can also be relieved of some of the anxiety which necessarily accompanies such an examination and can better commit themselves to studies other than those particular ones which prepare them for the examination itself.⁷

* * * *

"There are two major factors which will lead to a continuing need for interdisciplinary studies. First, the more highly developed specialized studies become, the more emphasis will be required on interdisciplinary studies just to bring the specialists and their studies to bear on any single problem. Second, population increases and the extension of longevity coupled with a greater amount of leisure time will bring a greatly expanded concept of adult education. Such adults are going to be much more free to roam in their studies and to cross over set disciplinary lines. Many who retire early, shift fields and embark on a second career. They have an interdisciplinary approach almost built-in. Those who no longer have to worry about accounting,

data processing, public relations, selling campaigns on a day-to-day basis will be seeking some sense to life in the kind of interdisciplinary studies which relate a Brecht play and a philosophical concept, Asian history and religious beliefs. Libraries are already seeing the results of longevity, because they serve a cross section of the public. I believe it will reach schools soon with a heavy impact."

* * * *

The data and questionnaires from this group of 14 in non-academic post-graduate careers suggest four conclusions:

1. The humanities graduates retained a strong inclination toward an educational career, even if they established themselves in non-academic vocations. Some were being drawn into teaching from a career outside education. Others found that their vocational activities were affected by or were at least not incompatible with humanities scholarship.
2. The breadth and integrational aspects of the humanities program (added to a broad undergraduate education) contributed value to adult intellectual and aesthetic life. It apparently conserved, accented, or opened up a number of humanistic interests which continued to be active in post-graduate years, even without vocational stimuli.
3. The academic and non-academic careers of the graduates pursuing vocations outside education illustrate the part which a humanities program can play in the adult lay community. As students, these men and women entered the graduate program without the expectation of measurable vocational rewards, in most cases.⁸ In their graduate and post-graduate interests they exemplified the possibility of reintegrating the academic and secular sectors of American society through general studies in the humanities.

* * * *

B. Master of Arts Graduates in Ph.D. Programs

Nine of the 47 Master of Arts graduates were active candidates for the Ph.D. degree when they responded to questionnaires in late 1964 and early 1965. Too, several of the teachers had had or were partially engaged in doctoral work, and some of those in non-academic careers had investigated or had undertaken study beyond the M.A. level at one time or another. In all, 20 of the 47 graduates offered information regarding the relation of the humanities program to doctoral studies. Data on the nine graduates identified as doctoral candidates show that they were similar to the rest of the 47 graduates.⁹ Considering the prestige accorded doctoral studies, and the frequent disparagement of the master of arts degree, it is interesting to note that the undergraduate and graduate records of

the nine Ph.D. candidates were respectable but not outstanding. Evidently, there were few among the entire group of 47 master of arts graduates who were not equally eligible for doctoral study.¹⁰

Table XVIII

Master of Arts Graduates in Ph.D. Programs

N=9: Men, 7 (77%); Women, 2 (23%)

Figures for total group of 47 shown in parentheses throughout

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
Undergraduate units in humanities subjects	4.5 (57)	44 (54)
Undergraduate grade point average in humanities subjects	3.04 (3.07)	3.00 (3.03)
GRE Humanities Area Test %ile rank (national scale)*	72 (87)	82 (95)
Age on receipt of M.A. degree	30 (32)	28 (30)
Academic years in graduate study required to earn M.A. degree	2.0 (2.5)	2.0 (2.0)
Post A.B. course units	33 (35)	33 (32)
Grade point average in M.A. program	3.35 (3.39)	3.33 (3.38)

*One who had a severe language handicap is excluded from the tabulation at this point. A peculiar distribution of ranks occurred for the remaining eight. Four ranked from the 90th-99th percentiles; the other four ranked from the 51st-76th percentiles.

The goals of the M.A. graduates who took up doctoral studies were (1) to prepare for teaching in four-year colleges and universities, and (2) to fulfill continuing desires for intellectual growth. Usually the two were combined. None of the graduates seemed to have sought material advantages only. The California junior college system offers salaries about as attractive as those of all but the higher professorial ranks in the average four-year institution. The latter, however, provides advantages

in the quality of students, lower teaching loads, opportunities for research and writing, and, many observers think, prestige.¹¹

Two points of information were especially solicited from the graduates who had had experience in Ph.D. programs. The first concerned the opportunities open to the humanities student, and the second concerned the applicability of the humanities master of arts to doctoral work. On both matters prospective M.A. candidates often seek information. The scarcity of interdisciplinary humanities programs has hitherto prevented reference to a pre-existing body of experience and information. Hence, the reports from the M.A. graduates have particular interest.

Graduates who applied for admission to the interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs at the University of Chicago and at Syracuse University received full credit for their M.A. work. Two received generous financial assistance. Those, however, who applied for admission to single-subject doctoral programs almost invariably encountered barriers. Those who entered a comparative literature program were least troubled by impediments directly traceable to the interdisciplinary character of their master's degree. Although they were deficient in language preparation, their new departments gave them some credit for graduate course work in literature. Several who applied for admission to English or philosophy programs either were refused or were required to make up deficiencies in those subjects. In one case, the M.A. in humanities was accepted in fulfillment of a "minor".¹²

The experience thus far gained by the M.A. graduates presents a dilemma. On the one hand, the direct line between master's and doctoral interdisciplinary programs is clearly marked. But such programs are rare. On the other hand, the greater availability of single-subject doctoral programs is counterbalanced by their plausible but severe disregard for graduate preparation outside their own fields. Some of the eligible and interested M.A. graduates persisted in moving into doctoral work despite set-backs and delays. Others found the practical costs of such a shift too great. It would appear, then, that unless practical means are increased to connect the master's and doctoral interdisciplinary curricula, potential doctoral candidates will be sacrificed.

To what extent did the humanities M.A. curriculum facilitate the progress of the doctoral candidates? Those in interdisciplinary programs felt they were as well prepared as students with similar training and better prepared than those from single-subject backgrounds. Graduates in typical unilateral doctoral programs reported initial disadvantages from the lack of concentrated preparation.¹³ However, deficits in subject-matter training usually disappeared after one term of doctoral study. In other aspects of Ph.D. work the candidates all believed they had derived strength from the humanities program. Training in handling ideas, in methods of advanced scholarship and criticism, and in establishing perspectives for inquiry and judgment stood them in good stead. Several remarked that these capacities were insufficiently demanded or expanded in their doctoral courses. Others thought that they would not be fully employed until a later stage of the academic career had been reached--in the dissertation or the classroom.¹⁴ Two reported that some of the doctoral work, or the pace the other candidates set, demanded greater effort from them than had single-subject course work at San Francisco State College. This disparity was not

reported with respect to the M.A. humanities seminars, however.

Considering the problems which these M.A. graduates met in attempting doctoral studies, the number of suggestions for changing the M.A. program was extremely small. Several Ph.D. candidates, confessing the advantage of hindsight, observed that they would have profited from additional single-subject courses. Only one clearly suggested that the M.A. program be redesigned to provide a concentration in a special field, however. Most reiterated their satisfaction with their earlier choice of interdisciplinary study. Again, a sampling from the questionnaires suggests the tone as well as the substance of the responses from M.A. graduates with experience in doctoral programs:

"My training in the interdisciplinary method of study has proved generally beneficial. At the same time, I feel that the M.A. program in humanities did not provide sufficient knowledge in any particular subject area. I am now finding it necessary to 'backtrack' in order to eliminate this deficiency."¹⁵

* * * *

"....my most serious problem at _____ was an attitude problem. I simply did not believe that the Ph.D. program was worth my time. I was not prepared for _____, yes! but I could have prepared myself had I desired. I found most of the seminars terribly dull (and recalled the excellent seminars I had while at State) and most of my fellow students downright cynical about the program. I am told that graduate students are like that everywhere, but I wonder... While at _____ I felt very little joy in studying--and for this reason more than any other I have withdrawn from the school and returned to teach at _____. I will complete the Ph.D. /in English/ at the University of _____.¹⁶

* * * *

"I found that in all courses where the work centered on individual research and the investigation of particular problems, I had a clear methodological advantage over the other graduate students who were enrolled in the classes. In the two Art History courses taken at the University of _____ with Professor _____ (visiting from Harvard) I could, and did, use actual work which I had done earlier for my Humanities M.A. as a basis for my projects."

* * * *

"My M.A. was enthusiastically received by Syracuse University, and credited in full; ...I was as well prepared as most students and better prepared than several."

* * * *

"Had I known I was going to do further work, I would have liked to have taken more English courses; but I find this kind of hindsight puerile and meaningless. However, I believe more 'high level' seminars would have been beneficial, from whatever point of view."¹⁷

* * * *

"No problem in being accepted at _____, but...I was required to do all course work required after B.A. except Hum. 201 /Art in the Humanities/ accepted grudgingly as a general aesthetics course requirement. I felt no better prepared than other students except less provincial in attitude from State work, but well prepared from Princeton Art History work and mentally alert from State work...I can suggest no ways for strengthening State M.A. for lead-on to other work, unless you wish to reduce the program to a sort of provincial junior college preparation for /a nearby university/."¹⁸

* * * *

"My only suggestion for advising others who intend to proceed in higher education is that they be apprised of the somewhat rigid and standardized academic categories--that their 'humanities' study should be pursued broadly but with a slight edge given to (and courses taken in) their special field of interest."

* * * *

NOTES

1. The questionnaires are shown in the Appendix. From the first of them basic information regarding current occupations was secured. The graduates then were asked to complete one of the two forms of the second questionnaire, depending on whether they were in academic or non-academic situations. One graduate never could be located. Of the eight who did not complete the second questionnaire, four were teachers. The other four included a doctoral candidate travelling abroad, a housewife, a business woman, and a very recent graduate who, when last heard from was working on a communal farm in Israel. The investigators were able to talk informally by telephone or in direct encounters with four of those who did not return the questionnaires, and to ascertain, by these means, that their viewpoints did not differ significantly from other graduates who had responded more formally.

2. Comparisons of the data in the tables presented in Chapters IV& V, and in notes thereto, can provide such hints. To go beyond guarded suggestions would be risky, however. Usually, a small change in the statistical data on one or two students in a group, or the assignment of an individual to one rather than another group (e.g., a doctoral candidate doing some teaching might have been called a teacher doing some additional graduate work) would distort the comparison. For example, the following tabulation of the grade point average distribution for the three groups seems highly suggestive.

Yet the proportional differences between groups involve only one or two students, at present. Such figures as are shown below in Table XIX will fluctuate noticeably whenever a teacher becomes a doctoral candidate, or vice versa, or when a prospective teacher now in a non-academic career earns his teaching credential and enters the classroom.

Table XIX

Grade Point Averages of Groups Pursuing
Different Careers

	<u>Non-Academic Vocation Group (N=14)</u>	<u>Doctoral Group (N=9)</u>	<u>Teacher Group (N=23)</u>
3.00-3.25 in M.A. program	43%	33%	22%
3.26 or above in M.A. program	57%	67%	78%
3.50 or above in M.A. program	21%	22%	57%
3.50 or above in undergraduate humanities subjects	28%	22%	13%

3. As an extension of the interest in above- and below-average graduates of the program (see Chapter III above), data were tabulated for the six in non-academic vocations whose grade point average was from 3.0-3.25 in the master's program, and the three who had earned averages from 3.50 upward. These data were compared with those on the graduates in the total group of 47 who had similar grade point averages. Comparisons based on differences which would rise or fall 20% after the addition or subtraction of one member of the subdivision are ignored. Other comparisons which might have suggestive interest include the following:

a. In the 3.0-3.25 subdivision of the graduates in non-academic vocations, compared to all in the total group of 47 who had similar grade point averages, the proportion of local or San Francisco area A.B.'s was relatively high; and the proportion of students with English or philosophy undergraduate majors was low. In this connection it can be noted that English and philosophy are the two most likely single-subject teaching fields for humanities graduates. There were no women in this subdivision of graduates in non-academic positions.

b. In the 3.50-plus subdivision of the graduates in non-academic vocations, compared to all in the total group of 47 who had similar grade point averages, there were no men; the proportion of middle-aged students was high; and the proportion of local or San Francisco area A.B.'s was low. Those who had had very high undergraduate grade point averages (3.50 and above) and high ranks on the GRE Humanities Area Test were relatively more numerous.

c. Between the above- and below-average subdivisions, the outstanding differences seemed to be the sex distribution in the samples; the predominance of local or Bay Area A.B.'s, the greater prevalence of humanities subject majors, and the frequency of minus-3.0 undergraduate grade point averages for the students whose graduate grade average fell in the 3.0-3.25 range. Those with above-average graduate grade records were comparatively more likely to come from institutions outside the region; to have had majors in fields other than humanities subjects; and to have had undergraduate grade point averages in the same range as their graduate records; they were high achievers on the Humanities Area Test, as well.

4. This is an interesting point because only one of the required humanities seminars concentrates on the arts. Elsewhere in the program, however, the arts are treated in conjunction with the other humanities to a greater or lesser degree.

5. Although relatively true, this comment does not stand entirely without qualification. The faculty includes several who are able to treat music effectively, but it is often the case that more emphasis is placed on the arts that can be presented visually. One may speculate on the consequence, some years past, of turning over a budding collection of music records (because of lack of storage space) to the college library, while the department retained its fledgling art slide collection. The latter now contains approximately 20,000 items and is within two minutes' walk of almost every classroom in which the humanities faculty teaches.

6. If this feeling is widespread, it has been well hidden. Rather, advisers discussing the requirement with applicants, find it taken as a matter of course by those aspiring to broad humanities preparation. No changes in the flow of entrants occurred when the requirement was instituted. Any course work which the candidates do to meet the requirement is excluded from that counted toward fulfillment of the degree program.

7. This comment did not come from one who had had misfortune on an examination, since it was not required at the time she was a candidate for the degree. Her suggestions typify the serious retrospective interest the graduates displayed in the program as they had known it or as it appeared in its revised form.

8. The tone of the college, one observer claims, is set by "the majority who pursue neither explicitly intellectual aims, nor sharply defined technical training, but stoically and unenthusiastically try to get through as quickly as possible." Their goal is the degree as a prerequisite for employment: Sanford, op. cit., pp. 163, 174.

9. Data on all 20 who might have been classed as doctoral students at one time or another gives no reason to think that the sample group of nine is atypical. As before (Chapter III; Chapter IV, note 3, above), notice was taken of the students whose graduate records appeared above and below the averages for the total group of 47. Three of the nine doctoral candidates were in each subdivision. Again ignoring differences which would be markedly changed by the shift of one student, both subdivisions (3.0-3.25 and 3.50 plus grade point averages) were on the young side of the mean age for the entire 47

graduates. Those with the high grade point averages had moved through the program more rapidly, relatively speaking. Neither of the two subdivisions scored as high as might have been expected (considering the total group of 47) on the Graduate Record Examination Humanities Area Test. Between the above- and below-average students, the most noticeable differences were in the prevalence of San Francisco State College A.B.'s and of minus-3.0 undergraduate grade point averages for the below-average graduates. Conversely, those with graduate grade point averages from 3.50 upward tended to be somewhat older, were less likely to have degrees from the College, more often had 3.0 or higher undergraduate grade point averages, and took less time to earn the M.A. degree.

10. Recent studies do not try to improve the reputation of the M.A. degree: Berelson, op. cit., pp. 185-190; Walters, op. cit., pp. 74-102; James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), p. 216 and passim; Conference on College Teacher Preparation Programs, Graduate Study for Future College Teachers (Joseph Axelrod, ed., Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1959), pp. 44-60.

11. In this connection, it can be noted that this group of doctoral candidates apparently had taken fewer units in humanities subjects, and spent less time in the M.A. program, than did the average student in the entire group of 47 graduates. Thus their single-subject preparation at the undergraduate level, at least, was probably not as great as might have been desired.

12. Gropper, op. cit., pp. 9, 15, reports that the desire for improved employment prospects apparently led 42% of doctoral candidates to go into graduate study. For 68%, the choice of the field of study had been influenced by other than purely vocational considerations. Women graduate students were not as frequently attracted to graduate education for the sake of job opportunities.

13. Of the several doctoral programs in humanities in the nation, the only ones which any of the S.F.S.C. humanities graduates entered were at Syracuse and Chicago. The institutions where M.A. graduates took up single-subject doctoral programs included the University of California (Berkeley; Riverside), Stanford University, the University of Washington, the University of Kansas, Tulane University, and Columbia University. Those at Stanford have been in English rather than the Humanities Special Program. The fields of the doctoral programs include English, comparative literature, art history, philosophy, psychology, and anthropology. Except for the latter two, these choices are typical of those made by others of the 47 graduates who contemplated or began doctoral work.

14. One graduate commented vehemently on the contrast between the "intellectual experience" of the humanities M.A. and the "standard academic exercises" in the doctoral curriculum. The "new direction of thought" engendered by the M.A. program "confused and sometimes hindered strict trade training....I honestly believe insistence on humanities questions learned at State applied to new work was responsible for the one B I got." Where his sympathies still lay, despite his rueful remarks, appeared in his conclusion: "Virtue is State's; the fault is that of the other institution."

15. This student had taken her A.B. in art, her M.A. in humanities, and proposed to undertake a Ph.D. in English.

16. The investigator has deleted the names of the institutions. The student earned grades of A in doctoral course work at the first institution he mentions. He is dissatisfied with the program at the second institution, where he intends to complete the Ph.D., but practical reasons enjoin him to remain with it.

17. Since earning his M.A., the program revision occurred which now calls for seven rather than four seminars in humanities.

18. This comment is interesting because in California the University of California has sole jurisdiction over degrees higher than the M.A. However, the University can enter into "joint doctorates" with the state colleges, if it wishes. At the rate thus far prevailing for the inauguration of joint doctorates, there should be ten such programs by the year 2000.

V. The Post-Graduate Careers of the
Master of Arts Graduates: the Teachers

In 1965 half of the M.A. graduates were high school, junior college, and college teachers.¹ Several who pursued careers outside education were preparing to teach or had been--and might again become--teachers. Most of the doctoral candidates had done some teaching and were, of course, aiming toward careers in higher education. In all, about 85% of the graduates had contributed to some extent to the academic professions. It was obvious, thus, that the humanities program had fulfilled one of its original purposes, the training of teachers. Since the preparation these teachers had had was relatively unorthodox, however, a number of questions could be raised. From what level of academic achievement did the teachers emerge? What relationships were there between their interdisciplinary training and their actual classroom assignments? Were there any problems in establishing a career due to the unusual character of their graduate work? In retrospect, what did the teachers think were the strengths and weaknesses of the humanities program as a foundation for teaching?

Table XX

Master of Arts Graduates in Teaching

(N=23: Men, 17 (74%); Women, 6 (26%)
Figures for total group of 47 shown in
parentheses throughout

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
Undergraduate units in humanities subjects	57 (57)	54 (54)
Undergraduate grade point average in humanities subjects	3.05 (3.07)	3.05 (3.03)
GRE Humanities Area Test %ile rank (national scale)	89 (87)	94 (95)
Age on receipt of M.A. degree	33 (32)	31 (30)
Academic years in graduate study required to earn M.A. degree	2.5 (2.5)	2.0 (2.0)
Post-A.B. course units	36 (35)	33 (32)
Grade point average in M.A. program	3.44 (3.39)	3.50 (3.38)

The records of the twenty-three graduates teaching in 1965 reveal that they were fully representative of the entire group of 47 M.A. graduates. If anything, they varied toward the upper side of the group averages in maturity, preparation, and achievement.

As the pioneer group of graduates in general humanities, those seeking teaching positions endured the disappointments and enjoyed the victories of pathfinders. Despite the fact that many possessed excellent records, a distressing number of them encountered difficulty in entering the profession. From the responses to the questionnaires and other sources of information, it may be estimated that at least one-third were harassed by (1) the scarcity of general humanities courses in the junior colleges and four year-institutions; (2) preferential interest of administrators and department chairmen in single-subject graduates who appeared better prepared to teach standard courses; and (3) confusion, disinterest, or (rarely) hostility in regard to interdisciplinary studies. The graduates overcame the single-subject bias of the schools by presenting extra qualifications and at least minimal preparation in a particular field. The latter usually had been provided by the undergraduate major and the English or philosophy courses in the M.A. program. Occasionally, additional post-M.A. courses had been taken. If the employer were satisfied with the applicant's single-field preparation, he then was likely to take a favorable view of the interdisciplinary degree. He was even more prone to do so if the candidate had taken work in a subject of special utility to the school, such as remedial English, or if he had had prior teaching experience. Even so, those with, as well as those without, extra qualifications sometimes experienced frustration and delay in launching their careers.

On the brighter side, however, at least as many graduates found that their humanities degrees were welcomed. Several were fortunate enough to locate openings to develop or teach interdisciplinary courses or combinations of courses in two or more fields. Others were selected for single-subject teaching because of the broad perspective they could bring to it. Some took high school positions that were immediately open, although they intended ultimately to teach at the college level. A few ignored openings for single-subject teaching in order to wait for an interdisciplinary position. In any case, even when these pathfinders had to adjust their plans to fit existing opportunities, they moved readily into their teaching careers. For reasons to be discussed hereafter, it seemed probable that this favorable trend would become dominant.

Among the 23 teachers in 1965, one taught in an adult education program, seven in high schools, eleven in junior colleges, and four in four-year colleges and universities. Not quite one-fifth of the present or former teachers had secured their berths through the College Placement Office. Others had made successful contacts by applying directly to schools (8), enrolling with a private employment agency (1), responding to queries from schools (3), acting upon suggestions from friends (5), or extending part-time teaching they had done before or during graduate study (2). Although in the later years of the period under study, both the faculty and the Placement Office of the College attempted to improve on their relatively poor record of assistance to the graduates, it seems evident that institutional employment systems still were not⁴ dependable for teacher candidates coming from an unorthodox degree program.

By far the largest number of the teachers were conducting classes in English in the high schools and junior colleges. One had a full-time philosophy position. Three were principally engaged in interdisciplinary programs. Scattered in the schedules of the group were courses in world literature, history, drama, creative writing, and French. Embraced by the English title were courses in remedial reading, composition, grammar, and literature (or mixtures of all four). Several had been invited to develop and teach Advanced Placement, "A-Lane," or Honors courses, mainly emphasizing literature. Two had taken the leading part in instituting humanities interdisciplinary courses.

This distribution of teaching subjects is readily explained. It follows, first, from the balances among subjects taught in the schools, as well as from the common fields of single-subject preparation of the graduates. It also reflects a deplorable tendency of administrators to assign junior faculty the "less attractive" classes, usually (but implausibly and erroneously) typified by remedial English courses. Finally, it displays the sense that interdisciplinary humanities courses, or courses enriched by interdisciplinary features, are rather special and advanced undertakings for most students (if not most faculty). Against this common opinion, however, it can be noted that in some of the junior colleges, terminal rather than on-going students are especially encouraged to enroll in an interdisciplinary course.

With few reservations, the teacher group believed that interdisciplinary studies were especially advantageous even for those teaching single-subject classes. They reported:

1. They felt more confidence than many of their colleagues, because they had a wider range of intellectual experience behind them when they entered the classroom. They believed that they could justify this confidence by reference to enriched course plans they had prepared within the framework of the single-subject discipline.
2. They could relate various subjects of the school curriculum to one another, history and literature combinations being most commonly cited by the teacher group. Several said that they associated literature with the arts, philosophy, and social facets of culture in their English classes.
3. They were able to respond to and draw out varying student interests and relate themselves to the differing emphases of their colleagues because of their broad humanities background. They believed that they were better teachers and more effective faculty members on this account.
4. They were able to adjust to the frequently-encountered necessity to take up a variety of courses in a short time-span. One teacher thought this period of rapid adjustment had been unduly prolonged because her superiors fancied that her training made her a "jack of all trades."

Accompanying these statements of confidence in the humanities program were suggestions for strengthening it. Several pointed out the practicality of a course in teaching basic English. A few saw by hindsight that additional courses would have been useful in the field wherein they later taught. It was not proposed that such work be substituted for more general studies, but that it be added to the program of candidates planning to teach. The

majority of suggestions, in fact, concerned further interdisciplinary work rather than specialized activity. Three hoped that future graduates could study the relation of the humanities to the social and natural sciences. Two wished there had been more emphasis on music in connection with the other arts. The most frequent suggestion was for systematic study of master-works. The graduates seemed to think that others expected them to be especially well informed and critical about the monuments of Western civilization. Perhaps, too, they had found that such major works transcended the single-subject bias of the academic community and could provide centers for interdisciplinary curriculum development. One graduate came close to this point in her suggestion that the M.A. candidates investigate problems and materials which especially demanded interdisciplinary scholarship and which would appropriately be treated in the public schools.¹⁰

Two responses were unusually thought-provoking. Both were conceived in the atmosphere of university scholarship and both concerned the fundamental nature of modern education. A former teacher and present Ph.D. candidate referred admiringly to a seminar at an eastern university on "Education and the Nature of Man"-- "the only truly interdisciplinary work I'd undertaken... aside from the work at S.F. State." With this course in mind, she advocated more study in the M.A. program of the means and ends of education. She denied that the matter should be left to the schools. Prospective teachers, she thought, should study the problem beforehand in the context of general humanities and other broad areas of thought.¹¹

The other far-sighted commentator first observed that present-day interdisciplinary scholars are often preoccupied with their effort to modify the existing single-subject disciplines of contemporary education. Yet, he went on, the future might bring different subdivisions in instruction and scholarship. "It seems possible, then, that...we should give serious consideration, not once-for-all but continuously, to what these new arts and disciplines might become, and to what the consequences of all possible lines of development might be, and constantly adapt all of our programs (but especially the M.A. program) so that our graduates can take a leading part in and exercise a wholesome influence on the future of education in California."¹²

In professional matters generally, and relations with colleagues particularly, the graduates reported both disadvantages and advantages arising from humanities preparation.¹³ The principal problem in such relationships, they reported, was suspicion or uneasiness on the part of supervisors and fellow faculty members. Humanities is "not recognized as a discipline," some were told. "Just what do you mean by Humanities?" An interdisciplinary approach to, say, a literary work sometimes seemed to disconcert colleagues. One graduate reported frankly that a broad viewpoint was "interesting, amusing, enriching to the possessor personally but of negligible professional value. The academic world doesn't speak Humanities."

Contrariwise, however, more graduates attributed professional advancement to their interdisciplinary degrees. Several found that the M.A. in general humanities evoked particular respect. "Because of this," one wrote, "I have been given the more academically inclined students...and have been permitted to take part in team teaching and/or honors lecture programs." Another is frequently asked to represent his department at faculty meetings

because of his broad interests (his chairman also leads the history and foreign language faculties and is obviously sympathetic to the interdisciplinary approach). The source of these professional advantages seemed to be the graduates' genuine ¹⁴ interest in and ability to communicate with their colleagues in several areas.

Lastly, the graduates were asked to estimate future possibilities for interdisciplinary teaching. Most of them were optimistic, although they usually--and prudently--qualified their hopes. One was inclined to think that "institutionalized interdisciplinary study is on the wane." He was cognizant, for instance, of the heavy seas breaking over many of the general education programs which emerged in the later 1940's and '50's. He added, however, that many orthodox departments were "not inimical to broad interpretations of their own fields." Three other graduates also were pessimistic about the future of formal interdisciplinary course work or programs, one having encountered inertia in the high schools and the others in the junior colleges.

These impressions of the continued scarcity of full-fledged interdisciplinary opportunities can readily be confirmed. Therefore, evidence of less formal developments was of interest. It came from teachers at all levels of the school system. First, there were those who had introduced an interdisciplinary approach into a standard course. In some cases they had felt the need for caution lest students or conservative colleagues become alarmed. In other instances, they were accorded freedom to experiment: "the teacher has to create these opportunities for himself." Second, as one graduate put the point, "the larger high schools, and those which are strongly academically oriented are including more and more interdisciplinary courses in their curricula; other, smaller schools, seem to be at least experimenting with such courses....Some schools call their programs Honors courses, Advanced Reading, etc., while others...use a team teaching approach." Again, independently-secured information coming to the investigators in 1965 confirmed this impression, both as to the location of the experiments and the type of innovation.

Third, several graduates gave examples of interdisciplinary course work within standard departments and under traditional titles. Courses in world literature, world history, or the arts were mentioned as instances of such internal development. One graduate thought that there would be further interdisciplinary development within the standard program of his junior college after an exemplary interdisciplinary course had been introduced. Fourth, two graduates thought that adult education and extension programs offered major opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching. The mature and non-specialized interests of the students in such programs would be well served by general humanities courses. The growth potential of this form of education was virtually unlimited, due to contemporary social and technological changes in the community.

Finally, several who believed that the future was promising called for vigorous "missionary" work in the field. Too many faculty and administrators were uninformed or misinformed about the interdisciplinary movement in general and the S.F.S.C. humanities program in particular. Others were interested and willing to experiment but needed access to professional advice and encouragement. The individual graduate did not always feel able to handle the problem

alone. The humanities faculty of the College, some said, should do more to publicize and explain its program.

One of the graduates summed up the several aspects of expanding opportunity. At his junior college, a survey showed that the students took a helter-skelter selection of courses to satisfy general education requirements in humanities. If such work were to be at all meaningful, he argued, an integrated course was needed. He continued:

"As of right now, however, the traditional disciplines are in greater demand. But then, the Humanities graduate can take a position in one of the traditional departments, get assigned to the right committees, and then start arguing for an integrated course. I did this at 'X' junior college, but was dismissed (for other reasons) the semester we were to initiate the course; I have done it at 'Y' junior college and survived--the first such course starts next fall. And this procedure has an added benefit: the course and department are 'yours,' from inception to actuality. I have found administrators most sympathetic to the need for integrated courses, not only in the humanities, but the sciences and social sciences as well."

Three conclusions can be drawn from the experience of the M.A. graduates who became teachers:

1. Interdisciplinary humanities preparation has led to successful teaching careers in the colleges and high schools. However, the single-subject orientation of the educational system presents problems for the humanities graduate. He may need to be exceptionally resourceful and persistent in seeking a position,¹⁵ and in many cases he will establish his career in a single-subject situation.

2. Opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching seem to be increasing very gradually. This group of graduates, at least, was encountering experiments in interdisciplinary course work and in ¹⁶ collaborative or integrative procedures in standard single-subject classes.

3. Taking account of all aspects of the teachers' qualifications and motives before, during, and after completing the master's program in humanities, it is clear that the graduates' will and effort to be humanities teachers led to their success. The M.A. program gave form, momentum, and professional status to their existing interdisciplinary interests. But they seldom found ready-made positions to occupy on the strength only of the humanities degree. Their contribution to education, therefore, has not only included the introduction of general humanities into school curricula, but the addition of a spirit of challenge and creativity to the schools in which they serve.

Indeed, in this respect the teachers were the more numerous but not the more representative members of the total group of 47 masters of arts in humanities. Those in non-academic careers and those carrying on doctoral study also met inconveniences, if not hindrances, as well as opportunities, if not encouragement. For them, too, it was not the M.A. program alone, but a firm commitment to integrated studies that led them to continue their intellectual growth and to contribute to that of the academic and professional community.

Notes

1. M.A. graduates had taught or were teaching in twelve high schools in northern and southern California and in the San Francisco Bay Area; at Grossmont, Chabot, Contra Costa, Yuba, Santa Rosa, San Francisco, Peralta (Lancey campus), Long Beach, and Diablo Valley junior colleges in California; City College, Chicago, and Olympic College, Washington; and the University of Chicago, San Francisco State College, Kansas State University, and the University of South Dakota.

2. As before (Chapter III; Chapter IV, notes 2, 3, and 9), data were tabulated for students with above- and below-average grade records in the master's program. There were eight in each subdivision. Again noting only the outstanding differences between such students in the teacher group and students in comparable subdivisions of the entire group of 47, it is suggested:

a. Both the above- and below-average subdivisions of the teacher group tended to be about two years older than members of similar subdivisions of the total group of 47 graduates; rather less likely to have earned their A.B.'s in the region; and more likely to have had undergraduate majors in English and philosophy.

b. Compared with one another, the below-average subdivision was most distinguished from the above-average subgroup by its lower mean age, and by the relative scarcity of members with high (95% and above) GRE Humanities Area Test ranks. It is interesting to note that the distribution of undergraduate grade averages follows approximately the same pattern for the below- and the above-average graduates who became teachers. In comparable subdivisions of graduates in non-academic vocations and in doctoral programs, the low ranking graduates tended to be distinguished from the high ranking students according to their lower undergraduate as well as graduate records, and vice versa.

A tabulation of data also was made for students in the teacher group who did above- or below-average work in humanities seminars. The above-average subdivision was almost identical with the comparable subdivision of the entire group of 47 in the distribution of undergraduate and master's program grade point averages, fields of undergraduate majors, and GRE Humanities Area Test score rankings (see Table VIII, above). The comparability of the below-average subdivisions was less uniform, although in view of the small number of teachers in the subdivision no differences seem open to meaningful interpretation, at present.

3. The number who had faced serious initial difficulty can only be estimated. Six actually said so in their responses on the questionnaires. Interestingly, all were either in non-academic or doctoral careers when they responded. Conversations with graduates over the years, reports from the College Placement Officer or from friends of the graduates, and similar sources indicated that there were more than six who traced disappointments in seeking employment to their interdisciplinary training. Of course, some allowance must be made for the part played in such situations by personal and accidental factors. Too, rejected applicants often are told that their preparation is inappropriate or inadequate, whether or not this is the principal reason for passing over them. What is certain is that the placement problem existed

often enough to warrant the conclusion that it might well exist for any graduate of an interdisciplinary program.

4. The Placement Officer and the humanities graduate adviser began belatedly to confer periodically and interchange information regarding possible openings. The former arranged his files so that he could bring into view the humanities candidates when single-subject openings were announced. The latter, hoping to improve the understanding in the field of the program's character, circulated his article on "General Education and Graduate Education" (Stone, *op. cit.*) to the deans of all California junior colleges. As time passed, the placement of graduates in various schools, as well as the student-teaching program in Bay Area junior colleges, helped raise the "visibility" of the program and its graduates. It is the investigator's opinion, nevertheless, that the faculty did not devote enough energy to solve this problem in the early years, and that present measures are no more than adequate. Vigorous efforts to establish better personal relations between the College humanities faculty and key personnel in the field have been repeatedly planned but postponed for lack of time in the heavy teaching schedules of both parties.

5. The arguments run thus: to profit from an interdisciplinary course, students must already have facility and information in several fields, or must be able to learn very rapidly in areas of their weakness. Or: students planning to go on to four-year institutions should prepare for a "major" by taking basic single-subject courses; but those who end their college education after two years do not need sustained study in any one humanities subject, and only should be "introduced" to the nature and pleasures of a number of them, especially in the creative and performing arts (to counteract their alleged vocational biases). Humanities graduates have objected to both lines of argument. Against the first they posit the need to start interdisciplinary studies early, in order that single-subject preparation will not harden into excessive specialization. As for the second, they deprecate the attitude which the argument usually conceals: serious humanistic and interdisciplinary study is neither profitable nor necessary for the terminal student.

6. The number of graduates in the teacher group precludes extensive quotation from their responses. Here, they have been summarized; elsewhere, in appropriate instances, brief quotations are added to the exposition. With respect to the graduates' opinions, it is evident that the present study is inadequate to provide critical judgment. Opinions of colleagues and supervisors should be considered. So also should examples and demonstrations of the teachers' performance. Speaking very strictly, the testimony may only indicate the graduates' high morale and loyalty to the humanities. However, most of them have advanced professionally over the years, and many cite instances of curriculum development which seem to reflect their influence and outlook.

7. The experience of the graduates in this respect seems to bear out one of the claims for the value of broad liberal arts training as the basis for teaching: Earl J. McGrath, The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education (New York, Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959), pp. 34-37.

8. Junior college credential candidates take a course in "Curriculum and Instruction." The M.A. graduates in humanities usually took the English "C & I" course, some finding it valuable, others not. Supplementary course work would have been helpful, several teachers stated, in the subjects of grammar, composition, or remedial reading and writing, because classes in English composition so often were part of their teaching program. Under current State credential regulations, those who take the M.A. in humanities and seek a junior college credential must present at least 12 units (post-A.B.) in a single subject. Six of the 12 units will be included in the M.A. program itself, and the remaining six can be allotted to aspects of classroom preparation, if the candidate desires.

9. See above, Chapter IV, note 5.

10. One graduate mentioned the undergraduate humanities honor course "Ancient and Modern Classics," in which a few masterworks are studied intensively. He proposed that the course be made a requirement in the M.A. program. The program revision of 1963, which affected very few of the 47 M.A. graduates, may go part way to meet their suggestions for the study of master-works. As previously noted, the final examination concerns such materials, as does tutorial study with the candidates' faculty sponsors.

11. Somewhat similarly, two teachers suggested that students in the terminal seminar of the program should develop plans for interdisciplinary courses and thus test their command of theory and practice.

12. The same graduate offered an interesting suggestion about the structure of an interdisciplinary program: "It may be that the prospective teacher would discover some advantage in concentrating his studies...in two disciplines, or rather in one discipline and one substantive field, say poetics and architecture, so that he could speak knowledgeably about all major theories of art and possess a solid command of architectural history."

13. The responses to the questionnaires represent attitudes, if not quantifiable facts. Eight graduates specifically reported advantages; five spoke of disadvantages. A more thorough study of relations between colleagues would need opinions from others in the faculties to which the graduates belonged. Impressions drawn from casual and unsystematic contacts leads the investigators to think that the graduates are fairly accurate in their reports of attitudes toward them.

14. Said one, wryly alluding to difficulties in securing a position in the single-subject educational system: "With my interdisciplinary training I have an advantage in discussion, but the specialists have the advantage in active accomplishments." Another took a position on high ground when answering the question about professional relationships. "Some /faculty members/ are educated teachers, and some are not, whatever they /have done/ as graduates."

15. The humanities faculty at the College is itself an example of the common combination of single-subject and interdisciplinary positions. Some members earned specialized Ph.D. degrees; others had interdisciplinary training. Most of them have joint appointments in humanities and a single-subject field, such as English. One of the graduates spoke to the point eloquently:

"When shall we agree that a true interdisciplinarian is one who, first, knows one subject well. I have heard the friends and the enemies of interdisciplinary scholarship confuse both themselves and the issue by refusing to acknowledge the intrinsic relationship between training and education, or--to shift the labels--knowledge and wisdom." This graduate's opinions could not be taken lightly. He came to the M.A. program from an undergraduate major outside humanities, did exceptionally good work as a graduate student, and went into junior college teaching. There he was instrumental in developing a course much like the College's general education humanities course, one which other junior colleges have sometimes thought was "too rich" for their students. He is the only one of the M.A. humanities graduates known to have published a book, an extremely original collection of readings on liberal education. After several years in the junior college, he taught for a term at S.F.S.C. en route to his present situation as a Ph.D. candidate in an interdisciplinary humanities program.

16. If the "general education" movement in the four-year institutions has lost some of its momentum, the concern for breadth and relationships, as well as depth and specialization, continues to appear in high places. Indeed, it may well be one of the prominent features of contemporary curriculum development in the lower schools, according to The Commission on Humanities, Report of the Commission on Humanities (New York, American Council of Learned Societies, 1964), pp. 17-30 especially.

VI. Conclusions: The Past and the Future

Since the humanities Master of Arts program at San Francisco State College is a going--and growing--concern, information regarding its first eight years of development can be as interesting for normative as for historical reasons. Prospective students now should be able to estimate their readiness to enter the program by comparing their own undergraduate preparation with that of the first 47 graduates. Full-fledged candidates can find guide-lines in this report which will help them appraise their progress and gauge the relative quality of their achievements. Those about to complete their work can anticipate what the future may bring, if they consider the post-graduate careers of their predecessors. Thus can hindsight fortify foresight.

In addition, the present study lays down base-lines for later investigations: past development compared to future growth and change; the S.F.S.C. graduates compared to those from other programs throughout the nation; theoretical designs compared to actual student behavior. To explore these ramifications would exceed the scope of the present discussion. But it would be eminently desirable to pursue them in a later inquiry which gathers and analyzes information about the next half-decade of experience in the program, which obtains comparable data from humanities programs elsewhere, and which traces the humanities movement into junior college and high school classrooms, where many of the S.F.S.C. graduates now are active.

Too, the study raises new questions. For example, it shows the great importance of motivation in the graduates' careers, but it does not identify the sources nor explain the modus operandi of this crucial force. It does not provide comparative data on successful and disqualified students, although it attempts to discriminate between the above- and below-average subdivisions of the candidates who earned the degree. Nor does it give detailed attention to the theories and methods of integrative study and action, either within the program itself or in the careers which the graduates adopted after receiving the master of arts. These subjects, also, should be studied thoroughly.

But underlying many particular problems is the most compelling question which participants in general humanities must face: what grounds are there for believing that it is a viable and valuable innovation in higher education? Doubtless, any curriculum in any discipline should be periodically subjected to questions of effectiveness and purpose. But the experimental character of an interdisciplinary program requires its advocates to be especially ready to take up the fair, but formidable question of legitimacy. What contributions does the present study make toward an answer?

The humanities faculty designed its program to fit the standards of all graduate curricula at the College. It was to differ from others only in its interdisciplinary and integrative content. The data presented herein show that the program fulfilled the faculty's intentions. Breadth, depth, variety,

and competence characterized the student population. Tables I-V, above, indicate that the successful graduates ranged widely in their academic origins, their maturity, their fields of interest and preparatory study, and the balances among their fields of preparation. While those who had had undergraduate majors in English or philosophy composed almost half the group, students from other fields within and outside the humanities area participated with great success in the program.

The graduates were required to excel in several fields. Comparatively, the program utilized more of their talent and training, and thus required them more fully to demonstrate competence than does a single-subject program. Their multidimensional strength produced a grade point average above 3.3 in the M.A. program. Forty per cent of them earned a 3.5 or higher graduate grade point average (Tables VII-VIII). Since the graduates were required to take at least half of their courses in specialized subjects, there was a safeguard against preferential evaluation by the humanities faculty. Table VII shows that the students were as effective in the special disciplines as in integrative seminars, and vice versa.

Supporting evidence of the quality of the students came from the fact that several subsequently undertook doctoral study. Some went into interdisciplinary programs and others entered traditional fields. Their undergraduate and graduate records do not indicate that this group was superior to the majority of the M.A. graduates (Tables XVI-XX). Hence it may be inferred that, on the average, most of the graduates were as eligible for admission to doctoral study as were the ones who actually chose to go on to the Ph.D. Too, those who went into teaching demonstrated parity with others in the profession. The problems that some encountered in securing positions came from the kind of preparation they had had rather than the quality of work they had done (see Chapter V, above).

On a relative basis, then, the M.A. graduates in humanities met or exceeded normal standards for advanced education, according to the data presented herein. The two main features of the program, the single-subject and the integrative components, reinforced and complemented each other. It was with the latter, however, that the students most firmly identified their interests during and after completing the degree. In addition, the program attracted students who otherwise might not have attempted graduate study. It "redeemed" not a few who had had relatively unimpressive records in single-subject disciplines. Many who planned to become teachers improved their academic records markedly. Women earned a fine record in the program, a fact of major importance at a time when the demand for college teachers so nearly outruns the supply of interested and qualified men (Table X).

None of the data suggests that the future will see a decline in the standards set by the first 47 graduates. On the contrary, entrance requirements have become somewhat higher than they were in earlier years. Too, the data now available provide better criteria to distinguish the well-prepared from the marginal student, and to identify the stronger and weaker candidates. The present program gives more emphasis to integrative humanities seminars than did the original curriculum. The data from the early graduates show that the seminars were at least as difficult as single-subject courses, and the greater number now required can be expected to test the students' capacities

more extensively. Finally, intensive integrative study of humanistic master-works on which the candidate is examined is an added feature of the revised and current M.A. program. Through the system of tutorial sponsorship, preparation for the examination is expected to be more thorough than before, more continuously demanding of the candidate's interest and effectiveness.

-li-

If the humanities program appears to be at least equal to any other graduate curriculum in its scope, demands, and the quality of its students, has it also demonstrated that it is as least as valuable to its graduates and to the community? The study reported here does not take up questions of intrinsic worth. But it does show that graduates and outside judges acted as if the program were valuable to them. The M.A. graduates were emphatic in expressing confidence in their interdisciplinary education (although they were discriminating enough to offer suggestions for improving it). They were especially committed to its integrative goals. The great majority had staked their futures on the value of general education as a life-long plan of thought and action. In 1965, 32 of the first 47 graduates were either doctoral candidates or (in most cases) college or high school teachers. Many of the remaining 15 had taught or were preparing to teach.

The fact that so many of the graduates won places in the academic profession suggests general approval of their interdisciplinary training. However, the study shows also that employment and admission to doctoral programs usually required the graduates to have at least minimal preparation in a specialized subject. Only a few of them found immediate and complete acceptance of interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching. Yet once in academic positions, the graduates were often able to introduce interdisciplinary methods and goals into their courses or curricula. Not infrequently, it was for this reason that many have been invited to participate in the most advanced, experimental, and challenging features of the school program.

The future appears to be more promising than the past, according to most of the graduates. They do not anticipate the decline of the need for single-subject preparation, but they think that the value of interdisciplinary study will become more consistently acknowledged. In the high schools and junior colleges of California, they report, there is a trend toward enriching the standard curricula by interdisciplinary and integrative means. There are also increasing possibilities for interdisciplinary studies in extension and adult education.

Thus, as a very productive source of enthusiastic and competent scholars and teachers, as well as of culturally-engaged citizens, the humanities program appears to have proved its value to the community through the post-graduate careers of its students. Its advocates--the M.A. graduates--report that there are still other intrinsic or instrumental values derived from integrative studies: breadth and tolerance of mind, aesthetic and philosophic maturity, variety in interests, compatibility with other scholars and citizens, and a sense of intellectual excitement. Pragmatically judged, in any case, the humanities Master of Arts graduates have repaid the intellectual community handsomely for such values as they may have received from the effort to launch and develop the program.

Bibliography

Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960)

Carmichael, Oliver C. Graduate Education (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1961)

Commission on the Humanities. Report of the Commission on the Humanities (New York, American Council of Learned Societies, 1964)

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963)

Conference on College Teacher Preparation. Graduate Study for Future College Teachers (Joseph Axelrod, ed., Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1959)

Eells, Walter C. Degrees in Higher Education (Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963)

Gropper, George L. and Robert Fitzpatrick. Who Goes to Graduate School? (Pittsburgh, American Institute for Research, 1959)

Knapp, Robert H. The Origins of Humanistic Scholars (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964)

Knapp, Robert H. and Joseph J. Greenbaum. The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953)

McGrath, Earl J. The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education (New York, Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959)

National Research Council. Doctorate Production in United States Universities, 1920-1962 (Washington, D.C., National Academy of Science, 1963)

Neudling, Chester L. and James H. Blessing. Graduate General Humanities Programs, Bulletin 1960, No. 12, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1960)

Sanford, Nevitt, ed. The American College (New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962)

San Francisco State College, Office of Institutional Studies. "Survey of Classified Graduate Students," unpublished memorandum, September 1, 1965

Stone, James H. "General Education and Graduate Education," Improving College and University Teaching, X (Winter, 1962), pp. 42-47

Walters, Everett, ed. Graduate Education Today (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1965)

APPENDIX
A

Questionnaires used in the research include:

1. Information survey
2. Questionnaire on Post-M.A. Studies and Professional Activity of M.A. Graduates in Humanities
3. Questionnaire on Post-M.A. Interests and Career

Please check the entries below for accuracy and add the information requested.

Return to: James H. Stone, Chairman, Humanities Department, San Francisco State College, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco 94132, California

Name:

Preferred and correct permanent address:

Occupation:

Name and location of firm:

Since receiving the M.A. in Humanities, have you been a teacher (any school or college level)? _____

Since receiving the M.A. in Humanities, have you taken additional academic course work? _____

Since receiving the M.A. in Humanities, have you pursued or earned a teaching credential or another advanced academic degree? _____

Questionnaire on Post-M.A. Studies and Professional
Activity of M.A. Graduate in Humanities

Post-M.A. Study:

A. Please describe as exactly as possible all studies undertaken since receiving the M.A. in Humanities. Especially important will be (a) subjects (course titles, if possible); (b) institution(s) where the studies were undertaken; (c) approximate level of the studies (e.g., undergraduate courses, graduate seminars, workshops, etc.); (d) approximate level of achievement (e.g., grades if recalled, or approximate "average"); and (e) dates when work was completed.

B. Please indicate the goal--formal or personal--of the studies undertaken above. Among these, it will be especially important to indicate such goals as the attainment of a degree or a professional certificate or credential, or the goals of personal interest, vocational or avocational improvement (without reference to any particular formal degree or other mark of achievement), etc.

C. Please summarize your ideas and impressions regarding the relationships of your post-M.A. studies to those you carried out to attain the M.A. in Humanities. Do you see the M.A. work as having provided capacities and interests which subsequently were further developed? Conversely, do you see deficiencies in the M.A. work which either impeded your subsequent studies or were remedied by them? Are there qualitative as well as subject-related differences or similarities in the M.A. and post-M.A. studies?

D. If your post-M.A. studies involved applications for admission to other graduate programs or curricula, please indicate the attitudes and policies toward your preparation on the part of the administration and faculty of other institution(s). Particularly, it is important to know such things as (a) whether you encountered any problems in seeking admission to other programs or curricula, and, if so, what they were and how you resolved them; (b) whether credit was given toward the advanced degree or certificate for either the M.A. degree, specific course work, or residency--

please be as specific as possible about negative or positive relationships between the M.A. work and the requirements of the later program; (c) whether you felt that you were about as well prepared as other students for the program or curriculum, felt better prepared, or felt less prepared--and in what ways; (d) and whether, in the light of subsequent studies or program requirements, you can suggest ways of strengthening the M.A. program in Humanities for those who, like yourself, intend to proceed onward in higher education.

II. Post-M.A. Teaching:

- A. Please list teaching positions you have held since receiving the M.A. degree, naming the school, courses or subjects taught regularly, and any special duties or responsibilities assigned to you.

- B. Please describe briefly the avenues of "contact" or application which you used in obtaining the positions listed above--e.g., the Placement Office of the College, direct application by yourself, etc.

- C. In view of the fact that "Humanities" is not a frequently defined field of teaching, did you encounter any difficulties in obtaining teaching positions; if so, what kinds of problems arose and how were they resolved?

- D. In what ways have you found that your M.A. program in Humanities were advantageous or disadvantageous to you as a teacher--in conducting the course work assigned you, developing courses or phases of courses, in collaborating with your colleagues, in relating students to the principal subject matter and characteristics of the humanities? Are there suggestions you can make as to how the M.A. program (as you encountered it or as it now appears) could be strengthened for the prospective teacher?

E. Please note that the liberal arts programs described in the inclosed outlines will constitute the principal academic preparation of elementary or secondary teachers who choose the Humanities major or minor. If you have any suggestions about the appropriateness of such majors and minors for the sub-collegiate level of teaching, please note them.

F. Simply as a member of the teaching profession, have there been advantages or disadvantages to you, with interdisciplinary training and an interdisciplinary degree, as you worked with others whose training and degrees were more specialized?

G. In your opinion are opportunities for teaching interdisciplinary courses in the humanities increasing? If so, are there more courses of this kind to be taught, or are there more opportunities within various kinds of curricula (e.g., history, literature, etc.) for interdisciplinary studies--or both?

Name and address:

All information above will be confidential to us, of course. But if you prefer to answer the questionnaire anonymously, please cut off the Name-address section, fill it in and send it to us separately from the questionnaire. In this way we will know that we have heard from you and have the information you can provide. but we will not identify the source of the information in the questionnaire itself.

Questionnaire on Post-M.A. Interests and Career

I. Interests and non-vocational activities: Are there any ways in which your interests and non-vocational activities have been stimulated, supported, or advanced by the studies you carried out for the M.A. in Humanities? Please describe:

II. Vocational career and activities: Are there any ways in which you utilize the knowledge and/or skills resulting from the M.A. program (or, at least, involved in the program) in your vocation, as such, or in some of the duties you carry out in your vocation? Please describe:

III. Other relationships between the M.A. program and post-M.A. interests and career. Are there relationships between your M.A. studies and your post-M.A. interests and activities in addition to those noted above? Please describe:

IV. Comments and suggestions on the M.A. Program: Are there suggestions you can make about how the M.A. program (as you encountered it or as it now appears) could be strengthened and improved for those who, like yourself, undertook it as a liberal arts program (rather than as a pre-professional or vocational program in teaching)?

Name and address:

All information above will be confidential to us, of course. But if you prefer to answer the questionnaire anonymously, please cut off the Name-Address section, fill it in and send it to us separately from the questionnaire. In this way we will know that we will have heard from you and have the information you can provide, but we will not identify the source of the information on the questionnaire itself.

Appendix B: Bibliographical Supplement
Review of Recent Writing regarding the Humanities

Introduction. A subordinate phase of the research reported herein was a review of recent writing on the humanities. One purpose of the review was to seek the perspective of current trends in theory and practice. Another was to compare the actual character and career of the students in humanities with statements about what the humanities and their disciplines should be. In selecting books, articles, and essays for review, the foremost concern was for materials purporting to be about "the humanities," generally or synoptically perceived, rather than for monographic works in the specialized disciplines. This consideration inevitably led to a concentration on the last two decades, wherein the general humanities movement developed significantly. Too, while relevant materials were discovered in a variety of general and scholarly periodicals, such sources as the Journal of Higher Education, the Journal of General Education, the Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, and Daedalus were especially useful. On these bases of provenance, the bibliographical sample represented by the commentary and listing below is thought reasonably representative, although not exhaustive. A few works have been included because of their prominence in integrated studies, whether or not they speak especially to the topic of general humanities. Others reflect the status of the general humanities movement by contrast with it more than by support of it. It goes without saying that omissions are inadvertent rather than deliberate. They offer an invitation to other scholars to improve this preliminary effort.

The review of recent writings on the humanities is reported in two ways. First, virtually in outline, the highlights of commentary are described and summarized. Second, the bibliography has been annotated with a simple set of symbols. Throughout, interest is in how the works relate to integrative and general humanities. These forms of reporting result in severe abstraction. However, they are designed merely as a starting point for those wishing to examine the literature. Once launched, the reader himself can categorize the results of his study to suit his own needs.

General observations. As distinct topics, "general humanities," "interdisciplinary studies in the humanities," or "integration" receive relatively little attention in recent writings on the humanities. Relevant statements seem isolated. Pragmatically, however, general humanities persists in higher education. Too, The Commission on the Humanities (15) elicited statements from some learned societies which emphasize integrative effort (e.g., American Studies, Renaissance, Metaphysics, Aesthetics). Yet the status of general humanities is well illustrated in contemporary writing by the Princeton Studies in Humanities (1963-5). These volumes review and represent the most recent trends in humanistic scholarship, education, and opinion in America. They are dominated by the theme of specialization (2, 13, 16, 31, 35, 36, 43, 59, 75, 78).

It is necessary to report, then, that the recent literature on the humanities affords little insight into the actual personal and academic careers of

graduate students in integrative programs. It would be a safe generalization to say only that, like some who contribute to the literature on the humanities, some students move from special to general interests; that the language students use to evaluate their commitment resembles that which humanistic scholars use to define the humanities and their merits; that practical integrative effort, whether in curricula, criticism, or scholarship, does not yet generate (as a rule) extensive studies or statements on general integrational theory; and that published writing on the humanities and the records of the participants in general humanities graduate programs, still remain prolegomena to a fully-developed art of humanistic dialogue.

The principal terms of such a dialogue appear in recent literature on the humanities as (1) definitions, descriptions, and defenses of the humanities; (2) statements regarding the propriety and broad forms of integrational study; (3) discussions of the relations between the sciences and the humanities; (4) efforts to determine theoretical grounds and designs for integration; (5) general education courses and programs, and their rationale and aim; and (6) interdisciplinary tendencies within the specialized disciplines of the humanities. Each subdivision often overlaps others. The highlights of each subdivision are as follows:

Definition, description, and defense. "The humanities" usually are defined as several fields of learning and expression (literature and the fine arts, philosophy and religion, history). Although they are distinct, they act as a group to preserve admirable aspects of culture and tradition; present and foster the most human and desirable of man's attributes; convey and exemplify praiseworthy traits of character, action, hope, and belief--man's values. They care about the individual, the unique; they respect man's emotions as well as his intellect. They explain, portray, and inspire man as a whole. Some writers define the essence of the several humanities historically, philosophically, or aesthetically. Many suggest that the humanities are differentiated by these defining attributes from other forms of learning and action. If there is a prevailing rhetoric and tone for such definitions, it is derived from the idealistic tradition.

Definitions in terms of a generic property or unifying force infrequently occur: modes of expressive power and form (10); significant nonoperational content of behavior (216); emotional quanta and manifestations of personality and identity (J. Katz and N. Sanford, 63; 100); the "condition of freedom" which certain disciplines (the humanities) engender (248). Occasionally, misgivings are expressed regarding orthodox ways of defining the humanities (97, 112, 174, 177, 191, 242, 280). But most writers offer their definitions as if to correct gross misstatements by "the public" or alleged enemies.

Integration. It has already been noted that comprehensive statements on the humanities give relatively little weight to integration. Its status is measured by the limited attention given it by The Commission on the Humanities (15, 42), by Russell Thomas /The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960 (New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962), 97-997, and by the Princeton Studies. The general editor of the Studies, Richard Schlatter, puts the point plainly in his prefaces (e.g., 13, viii): "Given the magnitude of the task /of the humanities/ and the impossibility of total perfection, the humanist scholar must, of course, specialize and his works will often be

esoteric. But the belief persists that somehow specialization must be converted to generalization if the humanist scholar is to complete his job. Humanist scholars have not solved the problems of excessive specialization and must share the blame for that catastrophe of communication which besets modern learning."

Even in a list of works selected for relevance to general humanities, many writers only allude to the integration of the humanities while denouncing specialization in education, research, teaching, and society as a whole. However, some (e.g., 42, 297) consider the possibilities of wholesome relations between specialization and generalization, or the necessity for both analysis and synthesis in the humanities (e.g., 41, 42, 66, 67, 68, 163, 181, 297). A few declare that integrative knowledge is the vital aim of the humanities or is essential to produce their appropriate values (79, 170, 200, 224, 241). The ground on which integration should be attempted is more often designated than explored: facts and values; instrumental means and transcendent goals; intelligence and emotion; learning and life; ideas and experience; past and present. Some commentators name the principal fields of study to be integrated, such as philosophy and history, literature and the nonverbal arts, etc. Still others surmise that one of the major subjects, properly conceived, can provide an integrated home for all the humanities. A few avoid the difficulties of using polar terms to ask questions about integration, and suggest that it may be the product of mind itself, suitably trained and stimulated; or of a given form of educative or scholarly enterprise (7, 11, 20, 64, 72, 163, 212, 237, 242). There are certain unifying conceptions, it is sometimes said, which can serve as integrative instruments (11, 86, 104, 111, 120, 152, 210, 213, 217, 246, 247). (See also, below, the notes on education, theory, and tendencies in the special disciplines).

The sciences and the humanities. Before and since Sir C.P. Snow's celebrated lecture on "The Two Cultures" (1959), relations of the sciences and the humanities have been much discussed (see, especially, writings marked NSH and SSH in the list below). Much that humanists say on the topic evinces skepticism about the alleged claims of science to preeminence in the study of man and all man's conceptions of the cosmos. Too, it often is said that the alleged indifference of the sciences to the concerns of the humanities has helped produce technological materialism and other social and moral conditions which humanists deplore. Some aver that science is pretentious if it is not grounded in or pursued in terms of humanistic knowledge-systems and values, or that the sciences are effective only when practiced by minds trained by the humanities to seek truth and love freedom.

Yet there are those who deem it absolutely necessary and entirely possible for the sciences and the humanities to exist and work harmoniously in some organic, complementary, or interactive relationship. To do so, such writers suggest, there must be less emphasis on specialization and more recognition of common features of epistemology, methodology, interest, and goals. With respect to the natural sciences, the humanities appear involved in the very nature of cognitive processes, as well as at the upper limits of scientific ends and values. With respect to the social sciences, the humanities are said by some to be both beneficiaries and benefactors, gaining knowledge of processes of human behavior and contributing knowledge of man's qualitative and creative nature (13, 37, 55, 94, 111, 115, 122, 131, 145, 148, 170, 175, 197, 225, 258).

General theories of integration. Although early writers on general humanities foresaw the need for theories of integration (7, 64) or offered them forthwith (39), the demand for theory is infrequent in recent writings (159, 175, 181, 244). Some who discuss integration evidently feel that the way is sufficiently clear to those who have the will (see "Integration," above). Occasionally, fear is expressed that there will be a premature or rigid codification of integrational conceptions (e.g., 269). However, essays in theoretical formulation do appear from time to time, and notable examples of the operation of theoretical positions can be cited (e.g., 4, 9, 34, 50, 56, are a few of the seminal works that have agitated or inspired contemporary students of general humanities). A number of theoretical statements emphasize the positive integrational relationships between the knower and the known, accounting for their inseparability in existential, psycho-social, or realistic terms (10, 12, 51, 55, 61, 100, 149, 156, 163, 173, 183, 205, 240). Others approach integration by theoretical considerations of the nature of knowledge or the configurations of knowledge-systems (11, 12, 23, 26, 57, 86, 104, 109, 122, 150, 152, 195, 206, 212, 213, 216, 233, 246, 287). Theodore M. Greene and Howard Mumford Jones continue to be distinguished spokesmen for the theoretical and practical integrating effectiveness of history and philosophy. Interesting theoretical proposals are suggested, also, with reference to the study of values (121), the total nature of objects (evidence, monuments) (96, 198, 246), themes or interpretations of human experience (47, 136), culture and social character (49, 160, 210, 238, 276), or the demands presented by selected studies of the life of man in society (137, 221, 267). Comparable theoretical inquiries are reported for the social sciences (279).

Education. For the past three decades, much writing on the humanities in education laments their apparent decline in prestige and patronage. It occurs to some to think that the humanities themselves share the overspecialization and analytic biases which (it is said) have reduced the status of the liberal arts (e.g., 15, 38, 41, 97, 121, 177, 242). Thus, antedating but strongly encouraged by the Harvard Report (32), the general humanities movement has been described both as a means of improving humanistic education, and as an embodiment of humanistic educational goals--perspective, the integration of knowledge, and the synthesis of values with thought and experience. The literature on the movement contains comprehensive surveys of programs and courses (e.g., 1, 7, 20, 21, 48, 54, 76), discussions of the common types of interdisciplinary courses (103, 107, 133, 141, 144, 211, 219, 220), and descriptions of particular courses and programs (3, 7, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 48, 72, 76, 89, 98, 99, 158, 193, 273, 277).

From these writings, it may be inferred that the prevailing modes of integrational thought are inclined to be literary and historical, on the one hand, or aesthetic and formal, on the other. In recent years, it appears that the two approaches are often blended by conceptions of cultural history that emphasize selected monuments in the humanities, rather than survey an accumulation of fragments; by studies of aesthetic form which seek perspective (e.g., in concepts of style) or close association with the personal and social experience of the contemporary student; or by consideration of themes and issues with both long-range and present-day humanistic significance. In the more extensive programs, the interdisciplinary effort appears to combine specialized study in one subject with work in several or (less frequently) in integrated courses where relationships and the processes of synthesis are foremost (54).

disciplines, at present. The organized metaphysicians and aestheticians are exceptions in expressing interdisciplinary interests, it appears (15). Some writers take the position that philosophic inquiry is itself the master humanities, or that its skills of inquiry, employed according to professional canon rather than adulterated by the habits and opinions of amateurs, should compose the principal part of a humanistic education; others desire to see a functioning federation, if not a union, of philosophy with the other humanities (39, 45, 51, 101, 150, 239, 265, 298, e.g.). But the integrative outlook of such writers as Cassirer, Greene, McKeon, Lamont, Langer, Northrup, Maritain, and Pepper, and the generous appreciation of philosophic learning shown by Greene and Jones, appears unusual, on the whole, in recent writing. In discussions of general education, professional philosophical contributors are not prominent (see education; also 103, 139). With respect to religion, however, the situation is reversed. In the academic environment, as well as with regard to its own concerns, the interrelationship of religion with the other humanities and with the sciences is much noticed (e.g., 18, 36, 59, 113, 166, 184, 243, 266, and many of the other listings preceded by the PR symbol below).

Full justice to the interdisciplinary factor in the special disciplines can be given only through bibliographical research in the disciplines themselves. From the standpoint of writers on the humanities, generally, such movements appear to be encouraging in the search for unified knowledge or for syntheses which respect, but are not thwarted by, the differentia of the arts and sciences. It is this theme, at least, which optimistically lightens the tone of recent surveys of the humanities (42, 73). It remains to be seen, in the later 1960's, whether this hope will be realized, or whether the forces of institutional specialization will outpull the efforts to develop integrative theory and practice.

* * * *

Recent Books, Essays, and Articles
regarding the Humanities

Note on annotation and abbreviations. Marginal symbols indicate the approximate bearing which each work (or parts and passages thereof) has to general humanities and to integrational problems in the humanities. The symbols A (fine arts), E (education), H (history), L (literature), and PR (philosophy or religion) signify that the author writes from the standpoint of the designated field but is in some way interested in its relationships to others. The symbols NSH and SSH indicate the author's interest in the relationships to the humanities of the natural sciences or the social sciences. Textbooks or anthologies exemplifying educational approaches to general humanities are identified by the letter T. Works which contain definitions, general descriptions, or defenses of the humanities, but are not essentially concerned with integration or with theories of integration are identified by the symbol D. Those which take up the question of integration overtly (and which therefore also provide definitions) are marked by the letter I. Works going still further by venturing into the problem of general theory (GT) can be assumed also to contain definitions and remarks regarding integration. In short, the symbols D, I, and GT designate works of major interest in regard to general humanities.

Integrational aspects of the several humanistic disciplines. Integrational and interdisciplinary developments within the subdivisions of the humanities are revealed by recent writings on the humanities, generally speaking. In the fine arts, one not only finds writers who praise the unique values or supreme unifying power of aesthetic form and appreciation (104, 138, 229, 281), but those who emphasize its relationships to other major kinds of individual and social experience (2, 15, 20, 26, 46, 49, 60, 61, 64, 91, 124, 130, 143, 151, 167, 177, 195, 222, 295). Efforts to provide a conception, methodology, or demonstration of integration involve considering the relation between verbal and nonverbal cognition and expression (2, 23, 26, 27, 46, 57, 85, 90, 156, 157, 161, 167, 197, 198, 201, 219, 270, 284, 289); of the relationships among the several arts (e.g., 27, 52, 230, 264, 271); and of the interactions between the arts and communication media, on the one hand, and the total flow of psychic and social experience, on the other (e.g., 11, 49, 69, 91, 143). These approaches lead to particular instances of integrational scholarship (e.g., the work of Panofsky, Hauser, Mumford, and others), and to various interdisciplinary or integrative college and high school courses (see examples marked "E" and/or "A" in the listing below). The problem which music presents is not unnoticed (31, 130, 164, 169, 261).

The historians' perennial engagement with theoretical problems has sharply increased in recent years (e.g., see 35, 66, 67, 68; note, also, the recent establishment of the journal, History and Theory; and the pronouncement of the American Historical Association leadership in 15, below). Concern about generalization and interdisciplinary study very commonly involves the social sciences. However, even in this connection, relations to the humanities may be emerging insofar as the behavioral studies themselves admit room for the arts, ideas, and psychology of man. The synthesizing role of history (153, 208), or its symbiotic relationship to philosophy, literature, or the arts (102, 179, 189, and the work of Barzun, T.M. Greene, H.M. Jones, and others) receives attention in some recent writing. The importance of historical knowledge in the humanistic realm of value judgments, as well as the relation of historical writing to other forms of expression, are matters of interest to writers on the humanities as well as on historiography.

The prominence of literary works and methods of inquiry in general humanities education persists in recent writing about the humanities and about particular interdisciplinary courses or programs. Literary scholarship itself, however, appears to be still struggling with questions regarding the relationship of literature to history, philosophy, and the other arts; and to some of the social, moral, and psychic goals said to be appropriate for the humanities (16, 42, 75). Confidence is expressed in the great (if not supreme) effectiveness of literature in humanistic education and as humanistic form (29, 64, 88, 119, 124, 129, 142, 260, 291). It appears that earlier irregular, though enthusiastic, bridges between literary criticism and anthropology, sociology, and psychology now carry increased traffic. Linguistics and communications theory, at one extreme, and sophisticated concepts of social dynamics or history, at the other, suggest still other possibilities for interdisciplinary effort. Exemplary attempts to depict an integrational context wherein literature functions synoptically as well as differentially can be cited (e.g., 11, 47, 155, 290; cf., also, notations on the arts and history, herein).

Philosophy is the most self-consciously autonomous of the humanistic

I/E 1. -----. General Education in School and College (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1953)

GT/SSH/A 2. Ackerman, James S. and Rhys Carpenter. Art and Archaeology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963)

E 3. American Council on Education, Cooperative Study in General Education. Proceedings of the Workshop in General Education. Volume II: Humanities (Chicago, American Council on Education, 1941)

I/L 4. Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis (Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1953)

I 5. Barzun, Jacques. Teacher in America (Boston, Little, Brown, and Co., 1945)

E 6. Baskin, Samuel, ed. Higher Education: Some Newer Developments (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965)

GT/E 7. Beesley, Patricia. The Revival of the Humanities in America (New York, Columbia University Press, 1940)

D/I 8. Boewe, Charles E. and Roy F. Nichols. Both Human and Humane. The Humanities and Social Sciences in Graduate Education (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960)

I/L 9. Burke, Kenneth. Attitudes toward History (New York, New Republic, 1937)

GT 10. Cassirer, Ernst. An Essay on Man (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1944)

GT 11. Cassirer, Ernst. The Logic of the Humanities (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1961)

GT 12. Chambers, Frank P. Perception, Understanding, and Society. A Philosophical Essay on the Arts and Sciences and on Humane Studies (London, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1961)

PR/NSH 13. Chisholm, Roderick M., and others. Philosophy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964)

GT 14. Cohen, Arthur A., ed. Humanistic Education and Western Civilization (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964)

GT 15. Commission on the Humanities. Report of the Commission on the Humanities (New York, American Council of Learned Societies, 1964)

I/L 16. Daiches, David. English Literature (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964)

T/I/E 17. Davidson, Robert F., and others, eds. The Humanities in Contemporary Life (New York, Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1960)

GT/PR 18. Dawson, Christopher H. The Crisis of Western Education (New York, Image Books, 1961)

T/I/A/E 19. Dudley, Louise and Austin Faricy. The Humanities (3rd ed., New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960)

I/E/A 20. Dunkel, Harold B. General Education in the Humanities (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1947)

I/E 21. Fisher, James A. The Humanities in General Education (Dubuque, Iowa, Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1960)

GT 22. Fishwick, Marshall W., ed. American Studies in Transition (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964)

T/GT/A 23. Fleming, William. Arts and Ideas (New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1955)

I/NSH 24. Foerster, Norman, ed. The Humanities after the War (Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1944)

I/E 25. French, Sidney J. Accent on Teaching. Experiments in General Education (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954)

GT/A/E 26. Graeffe, Arnold D. Creative Education in the Humanities (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1951)

I/A 27. Greene, Theodore M. The Arts and the Art of Criticism (Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1940, 1952)

GT 28. Greene, Theodore M., ed. The Meaning of the Humanities (Princeton N.J., Princeton University Press, 1940)

I 29. Hadas, Moses. Old Wine, New Bottles. A Humanist Teacher at Work (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1962)

I 30. Harris, Julian, ed. The Humanities. An Appraisal (Madison, Wisc., University of Wisconsin Press, 1950, 1962)

A 31. Harrison, Frank Ll., and others. Musicology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963)

I/E 32. Harvard University. General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1945, 1955)

GT/A 33. Hauser, Arnold. The Philosophy of Art History (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1958)

GT/A 34. Hauser, Arnold. The Social History of Art (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1951)

I/H 35. Higham, John, and others. History (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965)

I/PR/E 36. Holbrook, Clyde A. Religion, a Humanistic Field (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963)

GT/NSH 37. Holton, Gerald, ed. Science and the Modern Mind (Boston, Beacon Press, 1958)

D/E 38. Hook, Sidney. Education for the Modern Man (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1946, 1963)

GT/E 39. Hutchins, Robert M. The Higher Learning in America (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936, 1952)

D/E 40. Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1957)

I 41. Jones, Howard M. American Humanism (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1957)

I 42. Jones, Howard M. One Great Society. Humane Learning in the United States (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1959)

E 43. Knapp, Robert H. The Origins of American Humanistic Scholars (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964)

GT 44. Kwiat, Joseph J. and Mary C. Turpie. Studies in American Culture (Minneapolis, Minn., University of Minnesota Press, 1960)

I/PR 45. Lamont, Corliss. Humanism as a Philosophy (New York, Philosophical Library, 1949)

GT 46. Langer, Susanne K. Philosophy in a New Key (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1942, 1951)

GT/L 47. Levi, Albert W. Literature, Philosophy, and the Imagination (Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1962)

I/E 48. McGrath, Earl J., ed. The Humanities in General Education (Dubuque, Iowa, Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1949)

GT 49. McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extension of Man (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965)

I/A 50. Malraux, André. The Voices of Silence (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1953)

GT 51. Maritain, Jacques. Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry (New York, Pantheon Books, 1953)

I/A 52. Munro, Thomas. The Arts and Their Interrelations (New York, Liberal Arts Press, 1949)

I/A 53. Munro, Thomas. Evolution in the Arts, and Other Theories of Cultural History (Cleveland, Ohio, Cleveland Museum of Art, 1963)

I/E 54. Neudling, Chester L. and James H. Blessing. Graduate General Humanities Programs, Bulletin 1960, No. 12, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960)

GT/NSH 55. Northrup, F.S.C. The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities (New York, Macmillan Co., 1947)

I/A 56. Panofsky, Erwin. Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism (Latrobe, Penn., Archabbey Press, 1951, 1956)

GT/A 57. Pepper, Stephen C. The Basis of Criticism in the Arts (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1946)

NSH 58. Prior, Moody E. Science and the Humanities (Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1962)

PR 59. Ramsay, Paul, ed. Religion (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965)

GT/A 60. Read, Herbert. Art and Society (Rev. ed., London, Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1936, 1945)

GT 61. Read, Herbert. The Forms of Things Known (London, Faber and Faber, 1960)

GT/H 62. Riasanovsky, Alexander C. and Barnes Riznik, eds. Generalizations in Historical Writing (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963)

D/E 63. Sanford, Nevitt, ed. The American College (New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962)

GT/E/L 64. Shoemaker, Francis. Aesthetic Experience and the Humanities (New York, Columbia University Press, 1943)

I 65. Snow, C.P. The Two Cultures (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1959, 1963)

GT/H 66. Social Science Research Council. Generalization in the Writing of History (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1963)

GT/H 67. Social Science Research Council. Theory and Practice in Historical Study (New York, Social Science Research Council, 1946)

GT/H 68. Social Science Research Council. The Social Sciences in Historical Study (New York, Social Science Research Council, 1954)

GT 69. Sontag, Susan. Against Interpretation (New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1965)

GT 70. Stanford University, School of Humanities. The Humanities Look Ahead (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1943)

GT 71. Stanford University, School of Humanities. The Humanities Chart Their Course (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1945)

GT/E 72. Stanford University, School of Humanities. Elementary Courses in the Humanities (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1946)

I 73. Stevens, David H. The Changing Humanities (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1953)

GT/H 74. Strayer, Joseph R., ed. The Interpretation of History (New York, Peter Smith, 1950)

I/L 75. Sutton, Walter. Modern American Criticism (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963)

I/E 76. Walker, Robert H. American Studies in the United States (Baton Rouge, La., Louisiana State University Press, 1958)

I/E 77. Walter, Erich A., ed. Religion and the State University (Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan Press, 1958)

SSH 78. Wolf, Eric R. Anthropology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964)

I/E 79. Wynne, John P. General Education in Theory and Practice (New York, Bookman Associates, 1952)

Essays and Articles

Note on abbreviations. The following abbreviations are used for the titles of journals.

AQ	American Quarterly	JAAC	Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism
AS	American Scholar	JGE	Journal of General Education
ASR	American Sociological Review	JHE	Journal of Higher Education
AST	American Studies	JHI	Journal of the History of Ideas
At	Atlantic	JP	Journal of Philosophy
BAS	Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists	JR	Julliard Review
CAJ	College Arts Journal	KR	Key Reporter
Da	Daedalus (Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences)	MEJ	Music Educators' Journal
DAb	Dissertation Abstracts	Na	Nature
Dio	Diogenes	Sc	Science
EL	Educational Leadership	Sp	Speculum
ER	Educational Record	SS	School and Society
Ha	Harper's	TCR	Teachers College Record
ICUT	Improving College and University Teaching	VQ	Virginia Quarterly

I 80. -----, "The Future of Humanities in Graduate Schools," SS 92 (1964), 119-121

NSH 81. -----. "Science and the Humanities," Na 189 (1961), 695-697
I/NSH 82. -----. "Symposium: Science versus the Humanities in the
School Curriculum. A Philosophical Analysis of the Present
Crisis," JP 55 (1958), 987-1008

GT 83. Abell, Walter. "Toward a Unified Field in Aesthetics," JAAC
10 (1952), 191-216

I/NSH 84. Abelson, Philip H. "Science and the Humanities," Sc 138 (1962),
1376; 139 (1963), 677-678, 682

I/A 85. Ackerman, James S. "A Theory of Style," JAAC 20 (1962), 227-
237

GT/NSH/E 86. Ackerman, James S. "On Scientia," Da 94 (1965), 14-23

D 87. Agard, Walter R. "Humanizing Our Dangerous Age," VQ 35 (1959),
627-634

D 88. Agard, Walter R. "Our Classical Humanities--Refuge and Guide,"
VQ 38 (1962), 231-242

E 89. Aldus, Paul J. "Revitalizing the Humanities in the Small
College," JHE 26 (1955), 287-293, 341

NSH 90. Alford, John. "Art, Science and the Humanities in the College
Curriculum," CAJ 5 (1946), 162-179, 201-203

I/A 91. Alford, John. "Problems of a Humanistic Art in a Mechanistic
Culture," JAAC 20 (1961), 37-47

NSH 92. Amann, William F. "The Pseudoscientific Spirit in the Treat-
ment of Literature," JHE 24 (1953), 195-197

A 93. Arberg, Harold W. "Music and the Humanities," MEJ 49 (1963),
79-80

NSH 94. Arnett, Willard E. "Poetry and Science," JAAC 14 (1956),
445-452

D/NSH 95. Aron, Raymond. "The Education of the Citizen in Industrial
Society," Da 92 (1962), 249-263

GT 96. Arragon, R.F. "The Contribution of the Humanities," JGE 9
(1955), 11-16

D/E 97. Arrowsmith, William. "The Shame of the Graduate Schools,"
Ha 232 (1966), 51-59

I/E 98. Axelrod, Joseph. "Developing a Course in Life Values," in
French, supra, 61-76

E 99. Bardolph, Richard. "Integration of History and English,"
JHE 22 (1951), 422-431

GT 100. Beatty, Walcott H. "The Psychology of Becoming Human," EL 20
(1963), 247-251

PR 101. Berenda, C.W. "The Liberal Arts Function of Philosophy,"
JP 54 (1957), 19-20

GT/H 102. Berlin, Isaiah. "History and Theory: the Concept of Scien-
tific History," in Riasanovsky and Riznik, supra, 60-113

E 103. Berndtson, Arthur. "General Courses in the Humanities," JGE 7
(1952-3), 32-40

GT 104. Berndtson, Arthur. "The Nature of the Humanities," JGE 6
(1951-2), 228-238

SSH 105. Bierstedt, Robert. "Sociology and Humane Learning," ASR 25
(1960), 3-9

SSH 106. Block, Haskell M. "Cultural Anthropology and Contemporary Li-
terary Criticism," JAAC 11 (1952), 46-54

E 107. Block, Haskell M. "The Humanities and General Education,"
JHE 25 (1954), 468-474, 502

D 108. Boas, George. "The Humanities and Defense," JHE 22 (1951), 229-235

GT 109. Boas, George. "The Problem of the Humanities," JGE 10 (1957) 205-216

GT 110. Bogart, Max. "Literature and the Humanities Ideal," EL 20 (1963), 230-237

GT/NSH 111. Bohr, Niels. "On Atoms and Human Knowledge," Da 87 (1958), 164-175

D 112. Booth, T.Y. "The Duty of the Humanists," JHE 32 (1961), 61-69

PR 113. Boulding, Kenneth E. "Religion and the Social Sciences," in Walter, supra, 136-155

NSH 114. Brickman, William W. Editorial, SS 91 (1963), 159-160

NSH 115. Bridgman, P.W. "Quo Vadis," in Holton, supra, 83-91

I/E 116. Brinker, Paul A. "Our Illiberal Liberal-Arts Colleges," JHE 31 (1960), 133-138

SSH 117. Brodbeck, May. "Toward a Fabric of Knowledge--Common Elements among Fields of Learning," ER 43 (1962), 217-222

I 118. Brooks, Cleanth. "The Critic and His Text," in Harris, supra, 40-48

I 119. Brooks, Cleanth. "The Quick and the Dead," in Harris, supra, 1-21

I/NSH 120. Brooks, Harvey. "Scientific Concepts and Cultural Change," Da 94 (1965), 66-83

GT 121. Broudy, Harry S. "The Educational Claims of the Humanities," JP 55 (1958), 987-997

GT/NSH 122. Bruner, Jerome S., Philipp Frank, Paul Tillich, Lewis Mumford, Walter Rosenblith, and Henry A. Murray. "A Colloquy on the Unity of Learning," Da 87 (1958), 155-165

I 123. Buck, Philo M. "Who Killed Cock Robin? Literary Values and the Academic Mind," in Harris, supra, 58-66

I/L/E 124. Bush, Douglas. "Education and the Humanities," Da 88 (1959), 40-55

D/L 125. Bush, Douglas. "The Humanities," ER 36 (1955), 64-69

GT/NSH/L 126. Bush, Douglas. "The Humanities," Da 93 (1964), 1219-1237

I/PR 127. Calhoun, Robert L. "Theology and the Humanities," in Greene, No. 28 supra, 121-150

D 128. Chalmers, Gordon K. "A New View of the World," in Foerster, supra, 78-95

L 129. Chinard, Gilbert. "Literature and the Humanities," in Greene, No. 28 supra, 153-170

I/A 130. Cone, Edward T. "Musical Theory as a Humanistic Discipline," JR 5 (1957-8), 3-12

NSH 131. Coutant, Victor. "Science and the Humanities," JHE 28 (1957) 315-318

I/A 132. Daedalus, "The Visual Arts Today," issue devoted to an interdisciplinary approach to the arts: 89 (1960)

I/E 133. Davidson, Robert F. "Trends in the Humanities in General Education," in McGrath, supra, 289-308

D/E 134. Dearing, G. Bruce. "Education for Humane Living in an Age of Automation," SS 92 (1964), 305-309

D 135. DeVane, William C. "The Meaning and Function of the Humanities in Our Time," Southern Humanities Conference Bulletin 8 (1958)

GT 136. Dewey, Robert E. "Themes, Issues, and Solutions," JHE 29 (1958), 8-12

GT/SSH 137. Diamond, Sigmund. "Do Good Fences Make Good Scholars?", in Fishwick, supra, 83-100

A 138. Dixon, William M. "Civilization and the Arts," in Foerster, supra, 60-77

FR/E 139. Ducasse, C.J. "A 'Terminal' Course in Philosophy," JHE 24 (1952), 403-410

D 140. Educational Leadership, issue devoted to the humanities: 20 (1963)

E 141. Edwards, George W. "Integration of Humanities and Social Studies," JHE 20 (1949), 457-462, 489-490

D/E/L 142. Erskine, John. "The Humanities in the New College Program," JHE 18 (1947), 227-234

D/A 143. Erwin, Robert. "Up, Up, and Away with the Arts," AS 31 (1962), 572-583

I/E 144. Fisher, James A. "The Humanities in General Education: 1949-1959," in Fisher, supra, 232-258

D/NSH 145. Flexner, Abraham. "The Burden of Humanism," in Foerster, supra, 40-59

NSH 146. Fogel, E.G. "The Humanist and the Computer," JHE 36 (1965), 61-68

D/I 147. Ford, Nick A. "Cultural Integration through Literature," TCR 66 (1965), 332-337

GT/NSH 148. Frank, Philipp. "Contemporary Science and the Contemporary World View," in Holton, supra, 53-62

GT 149. Frank, Lawrence K. "Why Modernize the Humanities?", EL 20 (1963), 220-224

GT/SSH/PR 150. Frankel, Charles. "Philosophy and the Social Sciences," in Boewe and Nichols, supra, 94-117

I/A 151. French, Warren. "An 'Eye' for America," in Fishwick, supra, 36-52

GT 152. Garvan, Anthony N.B. "Historical Depth in Comparative Cultural Study," AQ 14 (1962), 260-274

I/H 153. Gershoy, Leo. "Heritage and Horizons in Modern History," in Boewe and Nichols, supra, 118-138

I/E/A 154. Gilbert, Allan H. "On 'A College Program in Aesthetics and the Arts,'" JAAC 4 (1946), 244-245

I/L/A 155. Giovannini, G. "Method in the Study of Literature in Its Relation to the Other Fine Arts," JAAC 8 (1950), 185-195

I/A 156. Gombrich, E.H. "On Physiognomic Perception," Da 89 (1963), 228-241

I/A 157. Gotshalk, D.W. "Interrelating the Fine Arts Philosophically," JAAC 9 (1950), 134-138

I/E/A 158. Graeffe, Arnold D. "Suggestions for a General Course in Humanities," JGE 1 (1946-7), 309-317

GT 159. Gray, J. Glenn. "The Philosophical Basis of General Education," JGE 12 (1959), 131-138

GT 160. Green, Lucille W. "Organic Unity in General Education," JGE 12 (1959), 125-130

I/A 161. Greene, Maxine. "Real Toads and Imaginary Gardens," TCR 66 (1965), 416-424

I 162. Greene, Theodore M. "Introduction," in Greene, No. 28, supra, xiii-xxxxix

GT 163. Greene, Theodore M. "Liberal Education in the Postwar World-- the Condition of Man," in Stanford University, No. 72, supra, 19-40

I/A 164. Greene, Theodore M. "The Problem of Meaning in Music and the Other Arts," JAAC 5 (1947), 309-313

I 165. Greene, Theodore M. "The Realities of Our Common Life," in Foerster, supra, 32-39

D/PR 166. Greene, Theodore M. "Religion and the Humanities," in Walter, supra, 120-135

I/A 167. Greene, Theodore M. "The Scope of Aesthetics," JAAC 8 (1950), 221-228

I/E 168. Grier, Edward F. "Programs in American Civilization," JHE 25 (1954), 179-190

A 169. Grout, Donald J. "The Divorce of Music and Learning," in Harris, supra, 152-168

GT/NSH 170. Guerlac, Henry. "Humanism in Science," in Harris, supra, 87-115

I 171. Gusdorf, Georges. "Project for Interdisciplinary Research," Dio 42 (1963), 119-124

SSH 172. Hager, Don J. "Integration of Humanities and Social Studies," JHE 23 (1952), 434-439

GT 173. Hague, John. "The Problem of Synthesis," in Fishwick, supra, 131-141

D 174. Harris, Victor. "Studying the Humanities--or What Drummer Do You Hear?", JGE 11 (1958), 185-191

PR 175. Harshbarger, Luther H. "The Role of Religious Studies in General Education," JGE 13 (1961), 169-179

I/NSH/A 176. Hausman, Jerome. "Toward a Discipline of Research in Art Education," JAAC 17 (1959), 354-361

GT/E/A 177. Hazard, Patrick D. "America as an Underdeveloped Nation," in Fishwick, supra, 53-66

I/SSH 178. Herring, Pendleton. "On Trends and Tendencies," in Boewe and Nichols, supra, 169-181

I/H 179. Holborn, Hajo. "History and the Humanities," JHI 9 (1948), 65-69

I/H 180. Holborn, Hajo. "The Science of History," in Strayer, supra, 59-83

GT/NSH 181. Holton, Gerald. "Introduction to 'Science and Culture,'" Da 94 (1965), v-xxix

I/A 182. Howerton, George. "Music as One of the Humanities," MEJ 49 (1962), 28-30

I/A 183. Hungerland, Helmut. "Perception, Interpretation, and Evaluation," JAAC 10 (1952), 223-241

NSH/PR 184. Hutchinson, G.E. "Religion and the Natural Sciences," in Walter, supra, 156-171

PR/E 185. Hutchinson, John A. "Four Questions on Religion and General Education," JGE 13 (1961), 149-159

I/E 186. Improving College and University Teaching, issue principally devoted to the humanities: 11 (1963)

A/E 187. John, Robert W. "The General Music Program," MEJ 47 (1961), 55-60

I/SSH 188. Jones, Howard M. "Development in Humanistic Scholarship," in Boewe and Nichols, supra, 81-93

H/A 189. Jones, Howard M. "Historical and Humanistic Values," in Harris, supra, 67-74

NSH 190. Jones, Howard M. "A Humanist Looks at Science," in Holton, supra, 100-109

I 191. Jones, Howard M. "The Humanities and the Common Reader," in Harris, supra, 22-39

PR/E 192. Journal of General Education, issue devoted to religion in education: 13 (1961)

E 193. Julianus, Sister M. "Humanities and the Appreciation of Culture," ICUT 11 (1963), 164-166

I/A 194. Kallen, Horace M. "Patterns in Events and Patterns in Philosophies of Art," JAAC 8 (1950), 145-154

GT 195. Kaminsky, Jack. "Dewey's Defense of the Humanities," JGE 9 (1956), 66-72

I/NSH 196. Keeney, B.C. "Dead Horse Flogged Again," Sp 30 (1955), 606-611

I/NSH/A 197. Kepes, Gyorgy. "The Visual Arts and the Sciences: A Proposal for Collaboration," Da 94 (1965), 117-134

I/A 198. Kouwenhoven, John A. "American Studies: Words or Things?", in Fishwick, supra, 15-35

D 199. Krauss, Franklin B. "What We Live By," KR 31 (1965), 2-4

I 200. Kuebler, Clark G. "The Special Significance of the Humanities in Liberal Education," in Harris, supra, 83-86

GT/A 201. Langer, Susanne K. "On Artistic Sensibility," Da 89 (1960), 242-244

I/H 202. Lamm, Herbert. "The Problem of Cultural Synthesis in History," JGE 6 (1951-2), 64-73

NSH 203. Lawson, Arnold. "Modern Science: The Old Adam," BAS 19 (1963), 28

GT/A 204. LeClair, Charles. "Integration of the Arts," in French, supra, 77-91

GT 205. LeRoy, Gaylord C. "Two Problems in General Education," JHE 29 (1958), 301-308, 350-351

GT/NSH 206. Levin, Harry. "Semantics of Culture," Da 94 (1965), 1-13

H/E 207. Lewalski, Kenneth F. "The Study and Teaching of History as a Moral Exercise," JGE 16 (1964), 237-245

H 208. Lockwood, Theodore D. "History and the Humanities," JHE 28 (1957), 1-9

D 209. McClellan, James E. "Why Should the Humanities Be Taught?", JP 55 (1958), 997-1008

I 210. McGiffert, Michael. "Selected Writings on American National Culture," AQ 15 (1963), 271-278

E 211. McGrath, Earl J. and L. Richard Meeth. "Organizing for Teaching and Learning: the Curriculum," in Baskin, supra, 27-48

GT 212. McKeon, Richard P. "The Liberating Arts and the Humanizing Arts in Education," in Cohen, supra, 159-181

GT 213. McKeon, Richard P. "The Nature and Teaching of the Humanities," JGE 3 (1949-50), 290-303

I 214. MacMahon, Donald H. "A New Approach to the Humanities," JHE 17 (1946), 415-420

D/E 215. Manning, John. "The Humanities at Michigan State University," ICUT 11 (1963), 167-170

GT/SSH 216. Marcuse, Herbert. "Remarks on a Redefinition of Culture," Da 94 (1965), 190-207)

GT 217. Mather, Kirtley, F. "On the Nature of the Unity We Seek," *Da 87* (1958), 135-138

SSH 218. Mayer, Milton. "To Know and To Do," in Cohen, *supra*, 206-230

E 219. Mayhew, Lewis B. "The Content of Humanities Courses," *JHE 27* (1956), 117-124, 172

E 220. Mayhew, Lewis B. "The New Colleges," in Baskin, *supra*, 1-26

I 221. Mead, Margaret. "The Future as a Basis for Establishing a Shared Culture," *Da 94* (1965), 135-155

SSH/A 222. Mills, George. "Art: an Introduction to Qualitative Anthropology," *JAAC 16* (1957), 1-17

H/A 223. Modisette, Eidon L. "The Legitimation of Modern American Architecture," *JAAC 20* (1962), 251-261

I 224. Morison, Robert S. "The Need for New Types of Excellence," *Da 90* (1961), 764-781

NSH 225. Morris, Charles. "Prospects for a New Synthesis: Science and the Humanities as Complementary Activities," in Holton, *supra*, 92-99

I 226. Mumford, Lewis. "The Making of Men," in Stanford University, No. 70, *supra*, 131-146

I/E/A 227. Munro, Thomas. "A College Program in Aesthetics and the Arts," *JAAC 4* (1945), 115-118

I/A 228. Munro, Thomas. "Aesthetics as Science: Its Development in America," *JAAC 9* (1951), 161-207

I/A/E 229. Munro, Thomas. "Art, Aesthetics, and Liberal Education," *JAAC 3* (1945), 91-106

I/A 230. Munro, Thomas. "Four Hundred Arts and Types of Art: A Classified List," *JAAC 16* (1957), 44-65

I/E 231. Murphey, Joseph C. "A Program in Integrated Humanities Studies to Provide Academic Foundations for Prospective Teachers at the University of Texas," *DAb 24* (1963), 2326

NSH 232. Murray, John C. "On the Future of Humanistic Education," in Cohen, *supra*, 231-241

GT/NSH 233. Nagel, Ernst. "The Place of Science in a Liberal Education," *Da 88* (1959), 56-74

I/E 234. Nelson, Jack L. and Gertrude A. Robinson. "Interdisciplinary Education for Teachers," *ICUT 11* (1963), 101-102

I 235. Newberry Library, Chicago. "The Seventh Newberry Library Conference on American Studies," *Bulletin 4* (1956), 29-43

I 236. Nichols, Roy F. "The Genealogy of Historical Generalizations," in Social Research Council, No. 66, *supra*, 130-144

I/E 237. Nichols, Roy F. "Why So Much Pessimism?", in Fishwick, *supra*, 314-329

GT 238. Nostrand, Howard L. "Toward Agreement on Cultural Essentials," *JGE 11* (1958), 7-27

I 239. Oates, Whitney J. "The Classical Heritage and Modern Scholarship," in Boewe and Nichols, *supra*, 182-193

GT 240. O'Brien, D.W. "Between the Two Cultures: an Existential View of Curriculum," *SS 89* (1961), 402-405

I/A 241. Ogden, Robert M. "The Fine Arts as Humanistic Studies," *JAAC 2* (1945), 59-68

I/NSH/SSH 242. O'Gorman, Edmundo, Harlow Shapley, Walter W. Stewart, and Gordon K. Chalmers. "The Humanities Today and Tomorrow," *AS 16* (1947), 461-476

GT 243. Ong, Walter J. "Religion, Scholarship, and the Resituation of Man," Da 92 (1962), 418-436

GT 244. Organ, Troy W. "Integration in Higher Education," JHE 26 (1955), 180-186, 229

E 245. Orr, Jeanne. "Humanities in the Visual Arts Program," EL 20 (1963), 243-246

GT/A 246. Panofsky, Erwin. "The History of Art as a Humanistic Discipline," in Greene, No. 28, supra, 91-118

I/NSH/SSH 247. Parsons, Talcott. "Unity and Diversity in the Modern Intellectual Disciplines: The Role of the Social Sciences," Da 94 (1965), 39-65

I 248. Perry, Ralph B. "A Definition of the Humanities," in Greene, No. 28, supra, 3-42

D 249. Peters, C.M.D. "The Education of the New Humanist," SS 92 (1964), 304-305

SSH 250. Peyre, Henri. "Twentieth Century Civilizations and Cultures," in Boewe and Nichols, supra, 139-168

D/SSH 251. Phillips, Bernard. "The Humanities and the Idea of Man," JGE 2 (1947-8), 129-137

I 252. Potter, David M. "Explicit Data and Implicit Assumptions in Historical Study," in Social Science Research Council, supra, No. 66, 178-194

D 253. Pound, Roscoe. "The Humanities in an Absolutist World," in Foerster, supra, 10-25

NSH 254. Price, Don K. "The Established Dissenters," Da 94 (1965), 84-116

D/E/NSH 255. Pusey, Nathan M. "The Centrality of Humanistic Study," in Harris, supra, 75-82

NSH 256. Rabi, I.I. "Scientist and Humanist. Can the Minds Meet?", At 197 (1956), 64-67

I/E 257. Randel, William. "The Case for American Studies," JHE 30 (1959), 73-76

NSH 258. Raven, Charles E. "Recent Changes in the Relation between Religion and Science," JGE 14 (1962), 185-200

I/A 259. Reiser, Max. "The Semantic Theory of Art in America," JAAC 15 (1956), 12-26

I 260. Richards, I.A. "The ??Future?? of the Humanities in General Education," JGE 1 (1946-7), 232-237

A 261. Ringer, Alexander L. "Music in the Commonwealth of Learning," JHE 32 (1961), 179-184

I/E 262. School and Society, issue devoted to education and values: 92 (1964)

I/NSH 263. Sears, Paul S. "Utopia and the Living Landscape," Da 94 (1965), 474-486

I/A 264. Shumaker, Wayne. "The Condition of Critical Valuation," JAAC 9 (1950), 21-30

PR 265. Shirk, Evelyn U. "Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Learning," JGE 10 (1957), 3-16

SSH/PR 266. Silverman, Hirsch L. "Religion, Philosophy, and Psychology," ICUT 11 (1963), 147-156

GT 267. Smith, Henry N. "Can 'American Studies' Develop a Method?", in Kwiat and Turpie, supra, 3-15

I/E 268. Smith, Huston. "The Interdepartmental Approach to Religious Studies," JHE 31 (1960), 61-68

GT 269. Spiller, Robert E. "American Studies, Past, Present, and Future," in Kwiat and Turpie, supra, 207-220

A 270. Stechow, Wolfgang. "The Fine Arts as a Humanistic Study," in Harris, supra, 135-139

I/A 271. Stechow, Wolfgang. "Problems of Structure in Some Relations between the Visual Arts and Music," JAAC 11 (1953), 324-333

I 272. Stone, James H. "American Studies: Some Observations," AS 1 (1956), 1-3

GT/E 273. Stone, James H. "General Education and Graduate Education," ICUT 10 (1962), 42-47

E 274. Sutton, H.L. "The Humanities--Campus Wide," JGE 12 (1959), 151-157

NSH 275. Swiegart, John. "Interrelated Knowledge--in Absentia," JHE 35 (1964), 256-263

GT 276. Sykes, Richard E. "American Studies and the Concept of Culture: a Theory and Method," AQ 15 (1963), 253-270

E 277. Taylor, Warren. "Integration in the Humanities," JHE 21 (1950), 84-86, 111-112

D 278. Ten Hoor, M. "Why the Humanities: Their Contributions to the Spiritual and Intellectual Life," JHE 34 (1963), 421-431

I 279. Thompson, Laura. "Some Significant Trends toward Integration in the Sciences of Man," Da 80 (1951-4), 173-186

D 280. Ullman, B.L. "What Are the Humanities?", JHE 17 (1946), 301-317, 337

A 281. Vivas, Eliseo. "The Function of Art in the Human Economy," in Harris, supra, 142-151

SSH/L 282. Vivas, Eliseo. "The Function of Criticism Today," in Harris, supra, 49-57

NSH 283. Von Laue, T.H. "Modern Science and the Old Adam," BAS 19 (1963), 2-5

SSH/A 284. Wallach, Michael A. "Art, Science, and Representation: Toward an Experimental Psychology of Aesthetics," JAAC 18 (1959), 159-173

I 285. Ward, F. Champion. "Principles and Particulars in Liberal Education," in Cohen, supra, 120-137

I/E 286. Ward, F. Earl. "The Humanities in General Education," JGE 3 (1948-9), 75-78

GT 287. Wasser, Henry. "Principled Opportunism and American Studies," in Fishwick, supra, 166-180

I/NSH 288. Weil, Eric. "Science in Modern Culture, or the Meaning of Meaninglessness," Da 94 (1965), 171-189

I/A 289. Weitz, Morris. "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics," JAAC 15 (1956), 27-35

L 290. Wellek, René. "The Concept of Baroque in Literary Scholarship," JAAC 5 (1946), 77-108

L 291. Wicke, Myron F. "Literature and Integration," JHE 17 (1946), 474-476

I 292. Wilhelms, Fred T. "The Unexpected Inch," EL 20 (1963), 225-229

I 293. Wilson, O. Meredith. "The Dilemmas of Humanistic Education in the United States," in Cohen, supra, 99-110

SSH/L 294. Wilson, Robert N. "Literature, Society, and Personality," JAAC 10 (1952), 297-309

I/A 295. Wimsatt, W.K. Jr., "Is a General Theory of the Arts of Any Practical Value in the Study of Literature?", JAAC 8 (1950), 213-220

I/E/A 296. York, Roy, Jr. "Humanities in the High School," MEJ 45 (1959), 44-48

I 297. Young, Donald. "In Praise of Specialization," in Boewe and Nichols, supra, 213-224

I/PR/L 298. Zerby, Lewis. "Philosophy and Literature," JAAC 5 (1947), 281-286

I/E 299. Ziegler, Jerome M. "Continuing Education in the University," Da 93 (1964), 1162-1183